HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME VIII JANUARY, 1915 NUMBER 1

[The EDITORS think the two articles following may have an interest in that they describe the present missionary situation from the point of view of an official at home and a missionary in the field, and that they reach substantially the same conclusions.]

THE MODERN MISSIONARY

JAMES L. BARTON

BOSTON

No one can speak with authority on the subject of the modern missionary policy of American societies, to say nothing of the societies that have their home in England and on the continent of Europe. Any general statements made with reference to modern missionary work can be successfully contradicted. No one appreciates these facts better than the writer of this article. Missions are so complicated and diversified, by tradition and practice, by the opinions of administrators, and by the ability and characteristics of the missionaries, that a vast and widely separating difference in a variety of respects runs through the whole body of missionary operations. Hence the almost insuperable difficulty of making general statements as to present missionary policy and methods without exposing oneself to a rejoinder that would be difficult satisfactorily to meet. It should be thoroughly understood that no statement hereinafter made can be of universal application.

We are bound to recognize that there is a fundamental difference between missionary societies. Some of them

put supreme emphasis upon oral preaching; others upon education and the development of educational institutions; some are interested primarily in industrial enterprises and the development of industrial training; while still others, perhaps embracing the larger number of societies, are interested in many forms of modern missionary endeavor.

What is said hereafter is based upon seven years of practical experience as a missionary in the heart of one of the great mission fields, followed by observations made in other important countries like Japan, China, India, etc. It has also been the privilege of the writer for twenty years to share in many missionary conferences, in which missionary policies, motives, and methods have been extensively discussed by representatives of the principal missionary societies of the world. With this, added to a continuous contact for the same period with administrators of missionary societies and with the practical problems growing out of such administration, he speaks, not for any one Board or Society but in a general way, of the modern missionary cause as a whole.

Much of the general criticism of missions and missionaries has been at times deserved. There have been and still are flagrant cases of sectarianism—more formerly than now—calling down upon missionaries and their work the just criticism of those who would put Christianity before sect and life before creed. It is not surprising that travellers coming into contact with this sectarian spirit have proclaimed the conclusion that the whole missionary cause is honeycombed by a provincial and destructive sectarianism. At the same time, in every mission field there is a small scattered and unrelated group of fanatical, independent, irresponsible missionaries. So far as the writer's observations go, these are among the most glaringly conspicuous missionaries in any country. They ostentatiously pose and are

vociferous in the declaration of their unusual consecration. Many general criticisms can be traced to some independent missionary or group of missionaries of this character who are condemned as severely by the missionaries of the regular missionary societies as by the unsympathetic tourists.

It must be acknowledged, moreover, that during the first century of modern missions which has just closed experiments were inevitable. There were no precedents for carrying on foreign missionary work in any country. It was inevitable that mistakes should occur, and, in view of the lack of co-operation at home and abroad, mistakes made by one missionary society were repeated by another and another. There are no more severe critics of the mistakes made during this period than the mature missionaries and the executives of the missionary societies.

Let no one think that either the missionaries or the executive officers of missionary societies regard their work as above and beyond criticism. The most of the societies welcome the criticism of the intelligent and unprejudiced.

There is much in modern missions that is frequently referred to as a change of policy which in fact is only the result of increased knowledge on the part of the observer. At the same time we must acknowledge that fundamental changes have taken place—especially during the last quarter of a century—in policy, methods, and motive, little understood outside administrative and supporting circles, which are rapidly bringing modern missions into the closest sympathetic relations with modern methods of Christian work at home. With a view to discovering some of these changes we will consider a few of the present aims and policies of foreign missions.

(1) There has been a marked change in the attitude of foreign missionaries and foreign missionary societies

as well as of the rank and file of the churches at home toward the non-Christian religions. It was not long ago that all non-Christian religions were labelled "false." One would have been a bold advocate of comparative religion who would have been ready, a generation ago, to declare that good was to be found in them all, that each non-Christian religion represented the result of the groping of other races and other peoples after God, and that they reflect and are the result of a human longing for communion with some spiritual Being or Beings. It was not long ago—even within the memory of some of us—that comparative religion was not taught in our universities or theological schools. Books written upon the non-Christian religions were superficially condemnatory. The marked advance in the line of investigation and publication on the subject need not be here discussed. All this has led to a more accurate knowledge of these religions, their history, development, and claims, thus bringing the whole Christian world into more sympathetic relations with the non-Christian world.

The modern missionary goes out with the purpose of conserving all true values in the religious thought, life, and practices of the people whom he approaches. The writer has never personally known of a missionary making attacks upon the religion or religious beliefs of the peoples of the East. The modern missionary proclaims a sympathetic, constructive gospel. One would travel far and wide today in the mission field to find missionaries using any other method of approach.

(2) Sectarianism is rapidly disappearing. It is the shame of missionary work that it has been so prominent in the past, but it has never been so glaringly conspicuous in the foreign mission field as it has been here at home. There have never been among missionaries or native Christians the same bitter theological controversies that have characterized denominational relationships

in Europe and America. At the same time, there have been differences which never ought to have occurred and which have done much to hinder the spread of Christian truth among non-Christian peoples.

Perhaps one of the reasons why sectarianism has not been more emphasized in the mission field is the fact that through some wise provision of Divine Providence natives of no mission country are able to pronounce correctly the names of the leading denominations of the West. At the same time it has been impossible for the most sectarian of missionaries—and there have been some—adequately to explain the actual difference separating the leading denominations of the world. One can well imagine how almost impossible it would be to make perfectly clear to an intelligent Japanese or Chinese or Indian the vital differences existing between half a dozen different kinds of Presbyterians or Methodists or Baptists, or why it is that differences resulting in our Civil War, and ending when the war ceased, should be now perpetuated in Asia. The missionaries have found it impossible, even had they been so inclined, to take time and strength to explain to the people of the East the causes that separate denominations in the West, in the face of their crying need to know God and their relation to Him and to each other, and to know Jesus Christ in his beauty and power. As some one has well said, a missionary becomes impatient of any demand put upon him to discuss the amount of water required for baptism with a man who is worshipping the cobra. Imperative urgency and need have compelled the elimination of sectarianism and the closer union of Christian forces for aggressive conquest.

One needs but to refer to the great foreign missionary conferences that have been held in the United States and in Europe, in which representatives of all Protestant missionary societies have come together to discuss the

great common interests of the cause. The missionary societies of North America have for twenty years met in annual conference. Growing out of the Edinburgh Missionary Conference there has been created a Continuation Committee of forty members representing the Protestant communions of the world. Thus the Christian forces are coming together for the elimination of the differences which have separated and for the combination of resources for world-conquest. This is indeed a modern movement, begun well this side of the middle of the last century, resulting in the mission fields in interdenominational theological seminaries, colleges, and medical schools, to say nothing of national non-sectarian churches. The modern missionary is Christian first, with sectarianism in the remote background.

(3) One of the most marked changes taking place in the foreign mission propaganda during the last century has been the shift of emphasis from the individual to society. The social aspect of Christianity was not given due recognition at home or abroad a generation ago. It is not strange therefore that while the missionaries were promoting great, sweeping social movements, international in character and fundamental in reach, they did not recognize them as such, but continued there as we did here to put supreme emphasis upon individual conversion.

Nowhere did Christian leaders, even a generation ago, rise above an individualistic conception of Christianity and grasp its great comprehensive outreach, as it puts its stamp upon the home, society, and the State. Here too the missionaries were well in advance of the Christian leaders at home in their recognition of the sociological power of the gospel they preached and taught. They began early to lay the foundation of Christian institutions which readily and quickly became larger than the individual. These missionary institutions and the ex-

tension of Christianity through them have exerted a fundamental influence for changing the ideas and ideals of the people and in creating a Christian sentiment and a Christian atmosphere. This change has been marked in many countries, as, for instance, in India, where the force of the Christian movement can no longer be measured by the number of those who have been gathered into churches, but where it is necessary to take into account the changed attitude of vast populations with reference to Christianity and especially to the person and character of Jesus Christ. One would make a great mistake today in attempting to establish the success of Christian missions by columns of statistics. The great subtle intellectual and social advance of Christianity in the non-Christian world is fundamental, far-reaching, and revolutionary. In every missionary country of prolonged occupancy, the missionaries note with as keen satisfaction these general, fundamental changes growing out of the introduction of Christianity as they do the rapid increase in the number of those accepting baptism.

While the missionaries do not lose sight of the individual—and cannot—they have reached the point where they plan for the development of Christian institutions that shall reshape public sentiment, instil their ideals and lofty purposes into every phase of society, and ultimately put the stamp of their teachings upon every department of social, intellectual, and national life. The missionary today is consciously face to face with the great national, social problems of the countries in which he is located; problems that are not exceeded, hardly approached, in importance or in scope by those that confront the social worker at home. The successful solution of these problems will produce a religious as well as a social revolution for the non-Christian world.

(4) Missionaries are the creators of educational systems and the promoters of modern education in all

countries entered. There has never been difference of opinion as to the importance of the missionaries' training "native helpers" at first hand. The discussion over education became earnest when the earlier training schools developed into collegiate institutions and when Western languages were introduced. Many supporters of missions favored the training of native workers, but refused to give for teaching Asiatic students mathematics, history, philosophy, and science. Some even took the ground that higher education was detrimental to the development of Christianity since it equipped the student for earning a living outside the Christian ministry. One missionary, in his objection to higher education and especially to the teaching of the English language, put it, that he was strenuously opposed to "equipping students with wings which they might use after graduation in flying away from the service of the mission into secular employment."

This battle-ground has been thoroughly fought over, and at the present time the missionary collegiate institutions as well as the schools of lower grade are recognized as legitimate means of implanting Christianity securely in the heart of the non-Christian world. Here too it was necessary to get away from the individualistic idea of Christianity to the broader conception of its mission in order to understand how a Christian college in a non-Christian land may become one of the most powerful constructive influences for breaking down prejudice and superstition, preparing the way for correct religious thinking, and establishing the principles of Christianity throughout the country. Missionary colleges and lower schools are today among the most honored and respected Christian institutions in the countries where they have been established, and in some of these countries they still hold supreme place. The Christian missionary is responsible for the present governmental education

system of India, and it is well known that modern education was introduced by missionaries into China in the face of persistent and united opposition of the *literati*, to say nothing of other countries where they have been the leaders in the development of the modern intellectual life.

Within the last ten years higher education in the mission field has received a mighty impulse owing to its increased popularity and in some cases to the urgent appeal of the people themselves for enlargement and extension of missionary institutions. The political changes that have taken place in many of the great mission fields have created an unprecedented demand for both men and women educated according to Western ideals. This has made the modern mission school of all grades popular beyond every expectation and has compelled a better equipment both in teaching staff and in plant. It has brought out a larger support on the part of the natives both by way of government grants and increased tuition. It has forced the development of high schools into colleges, and of colleges into universities. In Japan the Japanese leaders and the missionaries are urgently appealing to the Christians in America to unite in establishing one great general Christian University for Japan. The same is true with reference to China, although, owing to the great size of China, three or more universities are demanded.

The rapid growth of higher education has compelled the missions of various denominations to unite, thus bringing together the societies and denominations at home. In this educational movement there is being developed the closest co-operation between the different communions and Boards, the resultant institutions bearing the name of no denomination but known only as "Christian." The modern educational development in the mission field surpasses in scope and in significance and in rapidity

of growth that of any similar general movement in history. It is calling for the most expert Christian educationalists for every department of instruction, and especially for the organization and direction of educational systems.

It is a significant fact that at the present time in the Christian schools of the mission fields there are more than 3,000,000 pupils under Christian instruction. There are no religious tests for admission or for graduation. The position is taken with reference to religion that no one, either of the East or West, can claim to possess an all-round education until accurate knowledge of the history, claims, and content of Christianity, the religion of the greatest nations of the world, is obtained.

(5) It is not customary to think of the missionaries as having to do with the industries of a country, much less with its foreign commerce. Are they not sent out to preach the gospel? And what has the gospel to do with the creation of industries within the country or the development of commerce between that and other countries? And yet there is no other body of men and women who have gone out from the West into foreign countries who have contributed more for their internal development and external trade than these very missionaries. We may call this a "by-product" of missions, if we please, and yet the fact remains that just as soon as Christianity is implanted in any country and begins to develop institutions which spring inevitably from it, the industrial life of the people correspondingly improves and foreign commerce begins.

Experience demonstrates that as soon as an Asiatic becomes a Christian, he immediately begins to be, all things else being equal, worth more than he was before, not only to himself and to his family but to the society in which he lives and to his country. It has been proved that when the conservatism of the Oriental has been

broken through to such an extent that he is ready to change his religion, he is also more ready than before to exchange his old industrial customs and traditions for what is better. In other words, the Christians for the most part become reformers in things ordinarily considered quite remote from religion, and leaders in the introduction of new industrial as well as social ideas into their own immediate surroundings.

It would be indeed a short-sighted and narrow-minded missionary who would withhold his advice and assistance from individual Christians and from Christian communities, as they endeavor to throw off their old conservatism and strive to develop industrially along new lines. This may mean, as it does mean in many a mission field, the introduction of modern tools and training of natives in their use, the teaching of industries in a great variety of forms, and the development, on a small scale of course, of commercial enterprises that first claim the advice and aid of those familiar with Western ways. Some of the most encouraging and helpful modern enterprises in Africa and Asia had their origin at a mission station and were developed under the advice and direction of a foreign missionary.

It is a part of the foreign missionary's business to see that the Christian society becomes the most prosperous and progressive society in the country, and anything he can do that will lead to such a development becomes as much a part of his missionary work as does the teaching of school and the organization of churches. A church made up of ignorant, unprogressive, unenterprising beggars would make a poor show in any country as the Church of the Living God.

This development of missionary effort has risen from the conception that the Gospel is more than a gospel for the soul of man, but it is equally a gospel for his mind and his body and his environment, a gospel that

affects the man in all of his relationships, and that as such it must lift up and purify, glorify, and strengthen every relationship into which he enters. In Africa, it is just as much the privilege and duty of the missionary to see that the Christians move out of their old *kraals* into houses sanitarily constructed and suited to the preservation and development of moral character as it is to provide them places of worship. A missionary from Africa told the writer not long since that he had observed that the native preachers who knew how to make and lay brick and manufacture furniture and introduce improved methods of tilling the soil, were without exception the most influential and constructive preachers of Christianity.

The gospel that the missionary preaches is the gospel that gives an abundant life. Under the modern missionary interpretation, that means a broader, better, higher living along lines of modern civilization—a living that elevates the entire community.

(6) There has never been any question as to whether it were proper for a missionary to be a physician and to practice medicine in the mission field, because there has always been the example of Jesus Christ himself, of whose reported miracles more than one-half were miracles of healing. The original idea of medical missions was that they broke down opposition and prepared the way for the preacher. The medical missionary was therefore a kind of John the Baptist crying in the wilderness and preparing the way for him who followed with the direct gospel message. Hard after that was the idea that the practice of medicine among the needy and helpless was a clear, unmistakable demonstration of that for which Christianity stands. This second conception of the place of medical missions in the non-Christian world still stands unchallenged. Few fail to understand the benevolent character of medical missions, where the

doors of the dispensary and hospital are open and where the patient, however poor or forsaken, finds loving hands ready to receive him and minister to his needs. The power of the medical work is limitless.

But beyond this, medical missions have been demonstrating in an unmistakable manner the value of human life. This demonstration is necessary in lands like China and India, and in fact all or nearly all the non-Christian countries where the value of life is lightly held. Into such communities the medical missionary comes with his tremendous emphasis on saving life, and little by little the lesson is learned that any human life—all human life—is worth saving even at great sacrifice.

Beyond this, medical missions have introduced ideas of hygiene and sanitation. It would seem as if the East must have been long ere this completely depopulated through universal violation of every known law of sanitation. Medical missionaries have become in these countries not simply preparers of the way, demonstrators of fundamental Christianity, alleviators of unalleviated distress, but they are setting up new standards of living which cannot fail to produce a healthier, stronger, and more robust humanity.

To make this work permanent, medical missionaries are organizing medical colleges through which these new ideas of modern medicine and hygiene shall take root in the soil of the country itself. These medical institutions give young men and even young women thorough courses in modern medicine. These go out as practitioners to disseminate and perpetuate the ideals which they have acquired in the missionary institution.

The missionary Medical College at Peking, China, with its foreign and native staff, and with the senior class of Chinese students, threw itself into the breach two years ago when the pneumonic plague started in Northern Manchuria and began to spread, with its one

hundred per cent of fatality, down across North China and so threatened Japan and the whole known world. When it seemed as if nothing could stay its progress, the faculty of the Medical College in Peking with a large corps of volunteer Chinese students from the senior class set themselves to the task, and in three months the plague was stamped out, and in the meantime a serum was discovered that proved to be of great value. The medical missionaries who established the College at Peking performed for the whole world a service no money could ever buy, which is beyond all praise. This is but an illustration of what the medical missionary in his individual work, as well as through his teaching of natives, is accomplishing in stamping out the plague spots of the world. Through their effort cholera has ceased to be the terrible scourge it was a generation ago in Turkey and in India. If the missionary forces should be allowed to enter Mecca, they would get at the very heart of the cholera scourge of the Mohammedan world, and in a brief period, if left free to act, reinforced by their native pupils, they would make cholera almost an unknown disease.

In addition to the direct medical operations, the missionaries have been successful distributors of relief in times of overwhelming disaster, setting an example in the use of relief-money so as to preserve the self-respect of the individual while saving life. They have been the organizers of some of the greatest relief-movements of the century, as in India during the great famines in late years, and in Turkey during the massacres that left in their bloody trail tens of thousands of helpless widows and orphans. They have thus been the organizers of systematic, orderly, and reasonable relief at a minimum cost for a maximum of results. Whatever criticism may be brought to bear upon the ordained missionary and his methods and his work, one must stand in reverent silence before the medical missionary whose work is beyond

criticism, the beneficent results of which are touching the ends of the earth.

(7) We have left to the last in our discussion the subject of the doctrines which missionaries preach and teach and to which they are committed. There has been much misunderstanding on this point in the past, and there will probably be much in the future. There has been a change in emphasis at home in the presentation of Christian truth, and still greater changes will undoubtedly take place in the years to come. As the environments of men and their temptations pass through radical changes, it is inevitable that there should be different emphases in the presentation of Christian truth to meet the new need of the new time and the new methods of thought. While truth is the same in all ages, there is often a wide difference in its application; and while the needs of men are the same today that they have been through all time, yet there is often an imperative call for change in the methods of meeting them.

There is no doubt that one of the principal doctrines taught by the missionaries in the earlier part of the last century was the doctrine of salvation for the world to come. One needs but to read the sermons that were delivered at home at that time and study the books of theology that were printed and taught during that period, to note the fact that Christianity then put its supreme emphasis upon preparation for death. When a person was asked if he were "saved," it was implied to mean saved from eternal destruction and to eternal happiness.

At the present time, the missionary preaches salvation no less than before, but it is salvation for the life that now is—salvation to oneself and for himself, and to society and for society—salvation for the sake of the world in which he lives. It is now taken for granted

that if a man is saved for the life that now is, he will be abundantly prepared for the life that is to come. Our Lord announced that his mission upon earth was to give abundant life; the modern interpretation would say that Christ came to fit men to live and to live now. Missionaries today throughout the world are preaching to non-Christians the possibility through Christ of being saved now—saved from the sin of their present and past life, saved from evil habits, evil thoughts, evil purposes—saved from the destruction of their immortal life and made fit to live among men.

Little emphasis is placed upon redemption in order that one may inherit an eternal life of rest and peace with God; while over against this is the plea that men should be saved and need to be saved in order that they may give to their fellowmen and to the world a life that was intended for the world. In other words, the preaching of the missionary today is to lead men through their living contact with the Christ to empty themselves of the selfishness that has dominated them during their former life, and to be filled with the spirit of unselfish service which dominated the Christ, and which, when taken on by them, will send them forth to render a like service to their fellowmen. The theology of the missionary today aims at the saving of the multitudes for life, the abundant, unselfish, glorious, Christlike life, that they may make that life count for the spiritual upbuilding of their fellowmen.

This being the case, decreasing emphasis is placed upon creeds and mere forms of expression of belief. The missionaries are writing creeds less than they were in the earlier days. They are asking the native Christians, after they have had full and ripe experience in Christian life and service, to put into their own language and form what Christianity means to them; in other words, to give to Christian truth and life their own Oriental interpre-

tation. At the great Edinburgh Missionary Conference held in 1900, the chairman of one of the Commissions in presenting his report to that Conference made the following statement:

"We can never understand our own Holy Scriptures until they are interpreted to us through the language of every nation under heaven. We can never know our Lord Jesus Christ in fulness and in the length and breadth of His love until He is revealed to the world in the redeemed life and character of men out of every race for which He died."

This statement was manifestly approved by more than two thousand missionary leaders from the Protestant denominations of Christendom.

The doctrines of the modern missionary are becoming greatly simplified, and as such bear fruit in the words and in the living of those who take the name of Christian. They remember that Jesus Christ himself was an Oriental and that in order to appeal to the Oriental mind he must be clothed in the Oriental atmosphere, speak from the Oriental point of view, and show himself adapted to the Oriental heart.

To sum up, the modern missionary recognizes the universality of Christianity and its adaptation to the whole man and his environment. He regards his mission so to present the Christ in all his vital and vitalizing power that he may dominate individuals and society, so that there shall eventuate a rounded, enlightened, prosperous, progressive Christian civilization. The modern missionary therefore is a Christian worker of boundless vision, with the goal of his labor nothing less than nations transformed, new civilizations constructed on eternal foundations, and the ultimate consummation of the Kingdom of God on earth.

THE PROTESTANT MISSIONARY PROPAGANDA IN INDIA

J. P. JONES
MADURA, INDIA

A few years ago (1906) the Protestant missionary enterprise in India celebrated its bicentenary. A few months ago the centennial celebration of the founding of American missions in India was an occasion of much joy. It must be a matter of deep interest, not only to the missionary body, but to the members of our Christian community in America to study both the progress and the vast and, in some cases, revolutionary changes of this great enterprise on the mission field. Even during the missionary experience of the writer innovations have been numerous and fundamental. To those who think that the missionary enterprise is wanting in the spirit of the age, the transformations which have already taken place and are constantly going on will lead to astonishment. These changes have been coincident with and a part of the progress of the Christian world in thought and life, and embrace not only the forms and methods of work but also the fundamental principles which underlie and permeate the whole work. In the present paper it is proposed to study a few of these innovations which have marked the onward march of this great movement.

I. We will first consider the present motives of the missionary enterprise, as compared with those of a century ago. There has been, at this point, a very definite advance. That which now animates the mis-

sionary, and the Christian church and society which are behind him, is different from the motive power of a century ago. At that time it was the deep sense of the appalling condition of the heathen and the unutterable doom which awaited them in the future world, which stirred the Christian church to its first activity in their behalf. The command of Christ, his last commission, that his disciples go even into the uttermost parts of the earth to disciple the nations, was then recognized, but was a matter of secondary importance as the missionary motive. Today there is a change of emphasis given to these two motives. A sense of the love of Christ to our race and loyalty to him in his command to go forth as missionaries of the Cross, have today become the dominating note and animating motive of this great enterprise. When the writer sought appointment as a missionary, many years ago, he sent, with his application, a statement of his doctrinal beliefs and convictions. The sainted secretary of the society accepted this statement with the remark, however, that it was inadequate as to the lost condition of the heathen. The candidate was urged to acquire deeper convictions as to the impenetrable gloom and hopeless condition of the non-Christian world, with the idea that this only, or at least chiefly, would furnish an adequate motive to his life-work. That, to the secretary and to the missionary of half a century ago, was the supreme test of the doctrinal attitude and motive-conviction required. It is not that the condition of the non-Christian world has become to the missionary a matter of less concern, or that the ambition to save it is less consuming; but there has loomed up on his horizon another vision of compelling beauty and power which increasingly occupies his thought and demands his allegiance. It is the Christ of all authority and infinite love, calling men to go into the darkest regions of the

earth to disciple the nations. Loyalty and love to him have become the prime incentive to action. This last commission of our Lord is the Magna Charta of the modern missionary. It is not the cry of the heathen but the call of the Lord—not the vision of a hell which yawns to receive these undisciplined nations who know not Christ, but the vision of a Paradise which has been prepared for them and which now claims them—this it is which stirs men today to missionary consecration and service.

In other words, the supreme motive of a generation ago has been relegated to the background and has ceased to stir men as it was wont to do. For those peoples are no longer strangers to us as they were to our forefathers. In the onward march of civilization they have become our neighbors, yea, our brothers, the common children of the Heavenly Father. Indeed, this change has come to us as a necessary consequence of the modern vision of heaven and of earth. We think no longer of God as the dread King of the universe, but as the infinite loving Father and Saviour. His love now inspires the missionary's thought and has become the measuring rod of his appreciation and interpretation of Him. He knows also that He is the Father of all men and that His call to go and carry His redemptive message to the non-Christian world is the command of love. It has become the supreme test of discipleship that he is loyal to Him and, as never before, is spellbound by the vision of His love and is eager to run, even to the uttermost parts of the world, at the call of His service. The heathen are no longer to the missionary enemies to be shunned, but brothers to be converted and won to membership in the great family of God. The realization of this vision, the fulfilment of this duty, the inspiration of this universal love—this it is which finds today the supreme emphasis as the missionary motive.

II. In like manner the aim of the missionary enterprise is not entirely the same as it was even a third of a century ago. What did the missionary of the past hold, and what does the missionary of the present entertain, as the consummation to which he devotes all his life? Formerly it was particularly sought to bring individuals, through personal influence and teaching and prayer, into touch with Christ and into membership of his church. Former missionaries were largely individualistic in their activities and purposes. At the present time we note a transfer of emphasis from the conversion of the individual to the regeneration of the country. As Rev. Bernard Lucas has well said, "We now seek not to save the soul of the Hindu but the soul of India." In his interesting book, *The Empire of Christ*, he also presents this difference of aim by means of an extreme illustration. He compares the lost condition of the non-Christian world to a shipwreck. In the past the church was concerned with, and gave itself entirely to, the work of rescuing individual passengers who were in imminent danger of a watery grave. Now, however, the church thinks not so much of rescuing individuals as it does of saving the ship itself. By which he means that the missionary is at the present time more concerned with the condition of India, as a whole, than he is with that of any individual or class in the country.

All missionaries may not be conscious of this change of aim or of emphasis, but it enters into their deepest thoughts as it does into the animating purpose of their life and work. These two aims are not, practically, so far apart as they may seem; for no one will contest the statement that the only, or at least the most successful, way of saving the soul of India is by bringing individual Hindus, one by one, to Christ. Nevertheless, these different aims, even as a matter of emphasis, are of considerable importance. The missionary whose vision does

not carry him, in his ambition, to the uplift and salvation of more than a few souls or small communities in that great land, cannot possess the power and inspiration of a man who has taken the whole country into his love and purpose, and its regeneration as a definite object of his daily prayer and a distinct inspiration to all his activities.

In harmony with this difference of aim we also find what Mr. Lucas elsewhere characterizes as the two contrasted methods of "proselytizing and evangelizing"; by which terms he signifies the purpose of bringing individuals into organic connection with the Christian church, on the one hand, and the work of preparing the whole community fully to know and heartily to accept the gospel, on the other. It may be said that the earlier method and aim was the dominant one in past years. Missionaries felt that their work achieved little, and was practically without results, unless it brought men to an open confession of Christ and to a public entrance into the Christian church. At the present time missionary statistics signify less than formerly, and mere entrance into church membership conveys not so much value in permanent results as it once did. The missionary propaganda has two definite results, represented by the parables of the mustard seed and of the leaven. The growth of the church itself, represented by the mustard tree, is full of encouragement to the missionary worker; but it is by no means the only, indeed it is not the chief, encouragement which he finds in his work today. It is rather the leavening influence of the gospel, its assimilating and transforming power upon all the institutions and upon the lives of those people who have not accepted openly the Christian faith. The writer feels strongly that his chief encouragement has come through the leavening influence of gospel truth, its ideals of life, and its outgoing service upon the non-Christian community of India. In harmony

with this, the missionary finds his purpose increasingly realized, not so much in the numerical growth of the Christian church and community, as in the advancement of the Kingdom of God in that land. The Christian church, as an organization, has ceased to be the supreme aim of his endeavors and test of his success. It is of more comfort and assurance to him to witness the transforming influence of the gospel of Christ in that great land, whereby comes, without observation, the dynamic power of the Kingdom of our Lord. The missionary no longer regards the organized church of God as of supreme importance, but rather as one, though the greatest, instrumentality in the furtherance of the Kingdom of Christ. This is the Institution whose coming he daily yearns for, and whose growing power becomes the subject of his constant prayer.

It may be interesting to consider this subject from another viewpoint. We witness today a new and stirring motto—"The Evangelization of the World in This Generation." It is very much exploited, especially in young people's Conventions. It has found more enthusiastic promulgation, during the last few years, than has almost any other. There are difficulties involved in this motto. The first is that it is unfortunately connected in many minds with the well-known doctrine of the coming of Christ. It is maintained that Christ cannot come again until all nations have heard the gospel; hence their eagerness to conduct a certain type of evangelization. But if "evangelization" is to mean anything that will be of permanent value to the world, the work involved must be impossible in this generation. There is very little value in covering the whole world, in a short time, with a single preaching of the gospel to untrained heathen. This motto has not been promulgated by missionaries; for they know too well the supreme difficulty of the job in hand. They

understand that their work has only begun in a community when they have entered and first preached to them the gospel message. With infinite patience they must again and again visit them, give word upon word and line upon line and convey repeatedly the message, not only until it is understood and accepted, but also until it germinates in their mind and fructifies in holy lives and in a self-propagating church. The command is not only to go and bear witness, but also, and chiefly, to "*disciple*" the nations, a much more serious and difficult task. The aim of the missionary, therefore, is not that of sowing broadcast the seed of the Word, but also of patiently and in prayer watering that seed and cultivating that ground until it becomes verily Emmanuel's land, filled with a people who know him and who will be forever kept by him.

III. The Missionary Attitude toward Non-Christian Faiths.

This attitude has undergone a marked transformation during the last third of a century. It was till then generally believed that all the ethnic religions of India, and Mohammedanism too, were of the devil. It would have been blasphemy for one to say that God had had anything to do directly in the development of the past religious history of that great people! It was under the influence of this conviction that former missionaries, the writer included, offered themselves for service in India. Today a missionary candidate, with this conception of a God-deserted India, would not only be an anachronism but would also be spurned by India and an alien to the present missionary body itself. India is the most religious country on earth. That God should have left to its own ignorance and misery a people who are so "God-intoxicated" in their temperament and whose aspirations after God, during the last thirty centuries, are so marked in all their writings and institutions, is

preposterous. Even the ancient apostolic teaching should have warned them against such folly. The ignorance of the West as to the sacred writings of India was a substantial excuse for the contempt of past generations. Today the new hemisphere of Indian literature has been opened to us. While it is still true that the religious lapses of India were lamentable and numberless; that superstition fouled the most sacred precincts of religious thought and life; that conceptions of God descended to the lowest depths of grossest idolatry; that teachings concerning man and salvation were degraded and absolutely unworthy; and, above all, that the people were devoid of the purest light of God in the face of Jesus Christ; nevertheless, we must maintain that God did use these inadequate and limited means to lift this people to greater heights and richer blessings than they otherwise would have attained. The report of the World Missionary Conference of 1910 says in this connection: "Below the strange form and hardly intelligible language lies life, the spiritual life, of human souls needing God, seeking God, laying hold of God so far as they have found Him. Until we have at least reached so far that under the ceremonies and doctrines we have found the religious life of the people, we do not know what Hinduism really is." There is under all the errors and mean spiritual gropings of India a religious life of the people which has, in some way or other, been fostered by, or at least kept in existence through, some of these teachings and institutions which we so deplore.

Missionaries now differ as to the place and function of these non-Christian faiths as related to the future religious life of the people. Some agree with Mr. Farquhar in his excellent book, *The Crown of Hinduism*, that Hinduism and all other non-Christian faiths are to find their fulfilment in Christianity. This is a

position based upon the evolution principle. A vast number of missionaries, however, reject this theory, thus boldly stated, as a dangerous doctrine. Still they believe and teach that all the truths of non-Christian religions and all the aspirations of their worshippers are realized and fulfilled in Christ Jesus. Christ came, in a comprehensive way, to fulfil not only the vital truths of Judaism but also those of all other faiths. These are but isolated, distorted, prismatic rays of which he is the full-orbed Sun of light and life. It is neither adequate nor true to speak of ethnic religions as "the backward, undeveloped faiths which in due time will, if left alone, ultimately grow into the highest, each one reflecting its own peculiar light and giving its own coloring to ultimate truth." This conceit would seem more plausible if all these undeveloped cults were not much older than Christianity, and were not in a degenerate condition steadily descending into lower planes of ethical efficiency and spiritual attractiveness.

The new theory gives approval and dignity to many of the outstanding teachings of ethnic religions, which indeed have helped to preserve these faiths through many centuries of superstition, corruption, and error; but it does not give either sanction or sacredness to the faiths themselves. It rather shows that whatsoever services they may have rendered and whatsoever truths they may, even distortedly, have preserved in the past, their mission is now closed, and they must retire in behalf of a religion which presents in purity all the rays of truth which they ever reflected and proclaims that there is only "*one* Name given under heaven wherein men may be saved."

It must also be added that, whatever one's attitude toward the separate teachings of Hinduism or toward that whole amorphous thing called Hinduism may be, he cannot but look with profound sympathy and deep

appreciation upon the tender faith and mystic piety of the people. Our attitude toward the non-Christian religions is one thing; that toward the touching though blind devotion of their disciples is another. Professor Hogg, in the *Year Book of Missions in India* (page 121) has aptly said: "It is just as vital to the cause of Christ that uncompromising war should be waged against living Hindu beliefs as that there should be an ungrudging reverence shown toward living Hindu faith." The missionary attitude, therefore, is still one of unceasing antagonism to these faiths, both because (whatever they may have been in the past) they are grossly decadent and unequal to the task of leading souls to God and to salvation, and because the supreme light and blessing of Christianity and of modern civilization has dawned upon the land.

Another question of growing importance relates to some of the dominating thoughts and universal convictions of India. Are these to be regarded as foul errors, to be utterly overthrown and discarded; or is the new Christian faith of India to take account of these teachings and to adopt, or to adapt, some elements or aspects of them toward its own highest embodiment and strength in that land? The greatest struggle of the Indian church is yet to gather about this question. To illustrate: is there room for some type of Vedantic pantheism in Christianity? Even now a few missionaries are advocating, as a wise basis for the new Christian doctrine of God, the adoption of the qualified theistic monism of Ramanujan which is so popular in South India and even in other parts of the land. Others advise that the missionary body make friends with the universal Hindu doctrine of *Karma*, or retributive justice, and its corollary, the doctrine of transmigration. Hindus who are friendly to our faith claim, with a show of truth, that no religion can prevail or even survive in India which

does not, in some form or other, accept these universal and permanent postulates of the Indian mind. We know that in the history of our faith in the near East and West distinguished Christian teachers and Church Fathers have not hesitated to adopt and promulgate these teachings in some form or other; and it is not easily to be supposed that the self-directing Christian church in India will not, in the future, grapple with these problems, and always with a mental bias toward these fundamental doctrines of their ancestral faith.

IV. The Message to be preached.

No subject is of greater importance to the missionary propaganda than that of the message which it is to present to the people of that land. What shall be the content of the missionary message? In this matter modern missionaries are worse and also are better than their fathers. They are worse, since they are too much diverted from the simple gospel message and its proclamation because preoccupied by a thousand other subsidiary thoughts and absorbed by efforts to relieve the physical and temporal needs of the people. They are better than their fathers because they realize, as men of former generations did not and could not, the foreign aspect and accent of our faith as held and presented by the man of the West to him of the East. As the East, and especially India, is revealing itself increasingly to us, we learn the antipodal viewpoint with which they and we study and apprehend everything. In times past (and even now, in some cases) the missionary thought that all the doctrinal prepossessions, historical bearing, and even sectarian polities, which he had learned in the West, were equally valid and available for the East; but he now knows India better than this, and grasps more fully the significant fact that the gospel according to the West, in three-quarters of its content and in all its interpretative spirit, is and must remain foreign and

largely unintelligible and wanting in appeal to the people of India. It is distinctly a child of the Occident, harmonizing with Western characteristics and biassed and shaped by climatic influences and habits of life. Today the missionary strives to reduce the gospel to its primary content and simplest message; he unwinds the swaddling bands and elaborate robes and furnishings so tenderly wound about it by Greeks and Romans, Celts and Anglo-Saxons, and other Christian races, during their time of possession and propagation. How difficult indeed for any man to disentangle from his message those racial prepossessions which his own and other peoples were compelled to add to it in order to make it their own and to give it their own interpretation, which renders it palatable and delectable to them, omitting also their shibboleths which expressed it in their own patois and with their peculiar accent! So long as these foreign accretions, which are not of the essence of the gospel, are not separated from the true message of the Saviour and omitted from its presentation to India, so long will India continue to decline to consider it, because it has a foreign stamp upon it. It is "not Christianity but Churchianity," as one Indian recently expressed it. In other words, India is waiting for the unvarnished, naked message of the gospel—a gospel denuded of that crop of Western herbiage which should not be transplanted there if for no other reason than that it cannot live in the tropics. A few years ago the writer listened to a most eloquent address by Kali Charran Banerjee, the most distinguished Indian Christian of that day, in reference to this very question; and he will never forget the remark offered with all earnestness to the five hundred missionaries there assembled. "Gentlemen of the West," he said, "we of the East do not want your adjectival Christianity. What we need is the substantive thing." It is this "adjectival" type of Christianity

which has been too much in evidence in the missionary propaganda. The failure of Christianity thus far to become indigenous, prevalent, and triumphant throughout the land, is largely the failure of the West to adapt its Christian message to that people, which is really the inability to translate our faith back to its original terms, terms which are more intelligible and natural to the East than to the West.

This message must, for this reason, cease to be in the form of a doctrine, a philosophy, or an institution. It must become once more a purely *personal* message. India must be given an unembellished vision of a personal God in Christ Jesus. His personality must illumine and thrill the message. India must have the vision of the Mount of Transfiguration, when it also, with the three disciples of old, must "see Jesus only." And to them must be left to accept and to interpret his life and work in their own time and especially in their own way, which will be, most assuredly, in a way very different from ours. He will be to them the mystic Christ, loved by a mystic passion beyond anything ever known in the West. Listen to the passionate words of the famous Kesub Chunder Sen, who never accepted our faith but who loved Jesus with a warmth rarely known among Western Christians. "None but Jesus, none but Jesus, none, I say, but Jesus, ever deserved this bright, this precious diadem, India, and Jesus shall have it. My Christ, my sweet Christ, the most lustrous Jewel of my heart, the Bridal Adornment of my soul! For twenty long years have I loved Him in my miserable heart. I have found Him, though oftentimes persecuted, though oftentimes soiled by the world, I have ever found sweetness and joy unspeakable in my Master, Jesus. He, the Bridegroom, cometh among you. May India adorn herself as the bride, in her glittering apparel, that she may be ready to meet Him." Why has not

India the same right to claim from us what the Greeks sought from the disciples of old when they said, "We would see Jesus"; and why not also the same privilege with us to weave their web of faith about him and to formulate in their own way their convictions and doctrines concerning him, and to build up whatever institutions they may find appealing to them and suited to them in the New Testament? It is only when they can and will achieve this that our faith will become their faith, the living, inspiring, and triumphant faith of India. In other words, the man of the West must constantly endeavor to avoid obtruding himself and his Western inheritance upon the people, in order that Christ may have free course and be glorified in that land.

Of course it is unnecessary to add to this the conviction that, of all the Western excrescences of our faith, none is more unnecessary, objectionable, and injurious to India than the denominational craze and sectarian fervor which have, by their transfer there, made our cause so ridiculous and scandalous and impossible. But, thanks be to God, missionaries themselves are today becoming increasingly disgusted with, and are relegating to the background, these very things which all deplore.

V. The Work to be accomplished.

It should be said, in the first place, that the field for this work is the World. World-wide opportunities are inviting, so that there is no longer need of the prayer of the last generation, that God would open the lands of hermit nations to the gospel. India is already an open country. It is true that in a few places in some of the Native States the gospel finds no welcome. On the other hand, there are many open, inviting fields in that land that are practically unoccupied. There are twenty-seven Native States with no Christian workers whatever.

The missionary propaganda has many departments of work.

First comes the work of preaching the gospel. This is neither ignored nor minimized today, though it does not receive the exclusive attention of half a century ago. To it have been added many other departments which are useful and essential to the salvation and to the development of the whole man. Anything that appertains to human betterment finds place today in the scheme of missions. It is no longer the picture of the missionary of the early part of the nineteenth century, standing in the shade of a tree preaching to a few undressed savages. He is rather the leader and inspirer of a mighty organized enterprise, whose many departments of effort touch the life of the people at all points and seek to ameliorate the condition of man in all spheres of his life and activity.

The Indian missionary church has now so far developed, under foreign guidance, that it is, in many of the older missions, not only approaching self-support but also self-direction and self-propagation. Of the thirty-nine thousand Indian Protestant Christian workers, seventeen hundred are ordained clergy, men of growing culture and large responsibility, upon whose shoulders have been placed, to a considerable extent, the pastoral direction and leadership of the Indian church. This situation has released foreign missionaries for other departments of work. An increasing number of them are devoting themselves to the education of the six thousand youth who are studying in the thirty-eight Missionary Colleges, besides those in the one hundred and twenty-seven Normal Training Schools, the eighty-six Theological Schools, the one hundred and sixty Industrial Institutions, the four Medical Colleges, and the thirteen thousand five hundred Elementary Schools. In all of these institutions five hundred and fifty thou-

sand youth are being trained for life and service under the inspiration of a host of wide-awake missionaries. Hundreds also are devoting themselves to medical work connected with the six hundred and ten mission hospitals and dispensaries, where more than three million patients are annually treated. An increasing number are giving themselves to the production and dissemination of Christian literature, which department is rapidly becoming one of the most influential forms of missionary activity. As instruments in this propaganda there are more than fifty publishing houses and presses, some of which are among the largest in India.

Industrial training and work has also become an important part of the activity of these missions; and in this same line there are a number of Christian Peasant Settlements which have done more or less good in various sections of the country. Besides these, there are one hundred and eighty-one Orphanages, seventy-two Leper Hospitals and Asylums, eight Institutions for the Blind and Deaf Mutes, twenty-three Rescue Homes and twenty Industrial Homes. In these more than three hundred institutions, twenty thousand people are cared for. Indeed, such is the passion among many missionaries for all forms of philanthropy and humanitarian activity, that it threatens to limit and to injure the more common and fundamental forms of Christian work. While funds for the Christian enterprise are limited, and while the time and strength of the missionary force is very inadequate, many fear (and with reason) that this broadening out of the work must weaken the enterprise at its centre and dissipate the energy of missions to the detriment of the whole work.

As a part of this multiplying of the humanitarian channels of mission activity many apprehend also the danger that the line between Christian mission effort

and ordinary philanthropy will be obliterated. Indeed, some of the more advanced among the mission force have swung entirely away from the direct Christian conception of their propaganda and claim that they "are in India not to make Christians but good men and women out of the people"; as if, forsooth, the highest aim of the missionary has not always been to make good men and women *by* making Christians of them! If these two aims are to be placed in antithesis, the whole missionary conception must be largely covered with confusion. To many the chief danger is that missionary efforts and aims may be so multiplied and broadened out that distinctly Christian purposes will disappear and be supplanted by mere desires and activities for human betterment. The latter can thrive only when following the former and inspired by them. The missionary must give himself to the supreme effort of bringing men into loving relationship with Christ and his Kingdom. He is in India, not primarily or chiefly, for the amelioration of the temporal condition of men, or to bring to them the blessings of a Western civilization, but rather to bring Christ and his Gospel unto them that, through these, all other blessings may abundantly follow.

VI. The Modern Missionary.

There are fifty-two hundred Protestant missionaries in India—men and women of all shades of Christian belief, with all kinds and degrees of equipment for the work. Never was the missionary better equipped, on the whole, to render effective missionary service, and never was there a keener demand for missionaries of the best training and noblest character. He should be possessed of certain definite characteristics and qualifications.

1. He must of course be possessed of distinguished piety. Nothing can make this unnecessary or secondary, no matter how broad the basis or manifold the depart-

ments of missionary work. Whatever else this enterprise may signify, it cannot cease to involve, above all else, the transfer of the Christian faith to a new land. In this work no other force is comparable to the exemplification of sublime faith in a deeply devout and pious life. Some are in danger of forgetting this at a time when the work is so much specialized and departmentalized. The missionary, whether he be an industrial, a medical, an educational, or an evangelistic worker, must be qualified and adapted to reveal by life the highest spiritual type of his religion.

2. The missionary must be a man or woman of culture and of constructive thought. India, with its vast systems of thought, its profound metaphysics and subtle dialectics, must be supplied with the representatives of the highest training of the West. Vast changes are afoot there. The thought, the faith, and the institutions of the past are crumbling under the attacks of all the destructive forces of modern civilization. They tend to leave everything, even the most cherished things of life and of thought, with an interrogation point stamped upon it. These destructive agencies are legion. The missionary is almost the only constructive force in all the land for the upbuilding of faith and piety. He must know how to edify (build up) and to give full reason for the faith that is in him. These are days of growing culture. The college students of India have doubled in number during the last five years. Our cause must, therefore, have worthy leaders. He must be able to lead the pantheist through the pathway of reason to "Our Father who art in Heaven." He must make the devotee of intellectualism conversant with "the Power, not himself, which makes for righteousness."

He must also possess true sympathy with, and an appreciation of, the people and of their religion. The old era of conceit and contempt has lasted far too long. The

man of racial arrogance and of religious pride and vanity must give way to him who knows well and appreciates thoroughly the genius of our religion for fraternity and fellowship, and who realizes the religious genius of India, past and present. The Western missionary, even as the Western politician, in India, has been cursed too much with an arrogance which has colored his message and has helped to defeat his ends.

It is not enough that a missionary love the people; he must appreciate them also. The most serious difficulty in India at the present time is the racial one. India has unwillingly been brought into the British Empire. But in the Empire it has neither social nor racial position. The Hindu is classified with the Hottentot as an inferior, to be loved, it may be, but not to be esteemed. Indians resent this. They have been trained by the English to glory in their past and to esteem themselves highly for what they are now. The missionary should be the last one to deny to them the respect and the honor due to them.

He must also be a leader of men. It is of much comfort and help to him in this particular to know that the people of India have a genius for docility. They easily respond to worthy leadership. In this particular they are very unlike present-day Japanese, who insist upon being in the forefront of all movements. But the people of India look for a high type of manly character and sterling piety among their leaders, whereby they may easily be inspired and directed. This leadership, however, must be increasingly not of the official but of the personal, type. The missionary must be willing to stand in the shadow of the Indian and become to him, inoffensively, "the power that is behind the throne." His leadership must not be of the obtrusive, demonstrative kind, but one that loves obscurity, whereby its purposes

can best be realized and its cherished principles be exemplified and glorified.

VII. The Harmony of Missionary Agencies.

Until a few years ago there was as little mutuality and fraternity among Protestant missions as there is now between Catholics and Protestants. It was every society and every mission for itself. Whatever connection there may have been was usually a source of constant friction and unpleasantness. They kept as far apart as possible, that jealousy and opposition might be prevented or minimized. At the present time a marked change is everywhere apparent. Missionaries are becoming increasingly sensitive to the evil of sectarian narrowness and denominational shibboleths which have kept them apart and their work divided. The spectacle of this enterprise thus conducted by numberless mutually jealous and rival sections of our Protestant faith has disgusted the missionary body in all parts of India. They have been led to see the absolute necessity of comity, union, and fellowship among all representatives of our cause, if it is to triumph in that land. They realize, as never before, not only the futility, but also the absurdity of continuing in this the greatest conflict in the history of our faith by means of Christian forces which are disunited and disinclined to enter into close fellowship and mutual love and esteem.

The recent movement toward fraternal regard, union, and the spirit of federation in work has become the most hopeful and vital feature of the Protestant missionary enterprise in India. It has developed markedly on three lines during the last few years.

It has appeared in the form of mutual sympathy and fellowship in work. The separate activities of adjacent missionary bodies are, in many places, being united and a vigorous attempt is being made to reduce both expense and friction by the united prosecution of their

work. Different territorial boundaries are readjusted, with a view not only to reduction of expenses but also for the economy of the force of workers which is so lamentably inadequate.

The Church Federation scheme was launched at Jubbulpore in 1909. This movement has progressed and has already brought into its ranks many of the leading societies now at work in India. It is called "the Federation of Christian Churches in India," and, without interfering with the existing creed of any church or society which enters it, it aims "to attain a more perfect manifestation of the unity of his disciples for which the Redeemer prayed, by fostering and encouraging the sentiment and practice of union, by organizing union effort wherever and whenever possible, by making the welfare of all the churches in the Federation an object of vital interest and concern to all, by strengthening throughout the entire brotherhood the sense of a common life and heritage; and in general, to seek through all such effort to hasten the consummation of the kingdom of God in India." There is doubtless a large future for this movement on the wider lines of Christian Federal Union.

Organic Church Union also is definitely sought and indeed has been partially achieved. The ecclesiastical union of all the churches established in South India by the United Free Church of Scotland, the Church of Scotland, the Dutch Reformed Church of America, the Congregationalists of England and of America, including altogether a Christian community of one hundred and fifty thousand souls, into one ecclesiastical body called "the South Indian United Church," is perhaps the most remarkable result thus far achieved on this line. It is a noble testimony to these separate denominational societies in the home lands that they gladly acceded to the request of their missionaries by allowing those

Indian Christians, formerly connected with them, to become thus a separate body and organized into an Indian Church. At the present time the Wesleyan body of South India and the Basel Mission also are seeking union with the United Church of South India.

In addition to this there is a remarkable movement of the various types of Presbyterian communions to unite together; also a Pan-Lutheran movement has been organized with a view to bringing together the very different and conflicting sections which bear the name of Luther. In brief, the cause of union is marvellously popular in all parts of the land. The Indian Church itself is eager for this fellowship and the missionaries are heartily pursuing the same end, so that the prayer of our Lord—"that they all may be one"—may be rapidly answered.

And in order to add to the success and utilization of all these new forces for Christian union, God has directed the Continuation Committee of the Edinburgh Conference to come to the aid of India. Dr. Mott, as Chairman of the Continuation Committee, has certainly achieved a great and memorable work in these days of wonders, by organizing all Protestant mission forces of India into a more or less solid phalanx. By the National Council and the eight Provincial Councils with a host of subsidiary and affiliated committees, the work of union has reached a position of prestige and an organized expression of power such as no one even hoped for a few years ago. No encouragement has overtaken the missionary body in India, during the last century, which is comparable to that of the last decade, whereby the scattered forces of Christ have come together and are rapidly being welded, by love and fellowship, into one great dynamic for the redemption of that land. India needs nothing more than the vision and the impact of a united Christianity; and the eagerness of all the mis-

sionary bodies to realize this oneness of life and fellowship in Christian service is the most inspiring and hopeful spectacle presented by missions in India today. It is thus also that the church of the mission field is being prepared by God to wield the mightiest power by its reflex influence for the unification of the scattered and divided forces of the home lands.

VIII. The Relation between the Home Society, the Mission Organization, and the Indian Church.

These are the three bodies chiefly involved in this enterprise.

The Missionary Society is mainly concerned with the Home Base, in the cultivation of the mission spirit in the Home Church, and in securing and administering the funds necessary to conduct the work. Its influence is also much felt on the foreign field.

The degree with which Home Societies wield power in the administration of affairs on the mission field varies greatly in different lands. This influence, generally speaking, corresponds to the longitude of the country of the Society at work. For example, the Societies of the continent of Europe largely reserve the power in their own hands and give little liberty of action to their representatives on the mission field. Moving westward we come to Great Britain, which keeps a wholesome check upon its missions while at the same time giving them many rights of initiative. Coming still farther west we behold the Societies of the United States of America, which grant to their foreign missions almost complete autonomy of action and self-direction. This is perhaps more than ought to be given to them; provided of course that every Society keep in closest touch with and is thoroughly well informed about its missions. A Society which does not thus thoroughly know all the affairs of its missions should not assume that it has wisdom enough to warrant its interference with their deliberate and unanimous action.

On the mission field there are two bodies—the Mission Organization and the Indian Church—whose relationship is ever changing and is becoming increasingly tense. In the first stages of the life and activities of a mission there is no Native Church to consider; or it is in such infantile helplessness as to possess little thought or will of its own. Its life and interests are in the care and keeping of the Mission. But when the church comes to a stage of self-consciousness, with ever-increasing ability to support and to direct itself, it naturally and increasingly demands from the Mission the ecclesiastical and administrative power which the Mission has hitherto held in its own hands. It is not every Mission that possesses the wisdom rightly to decide how far to withhold this power or to transfer it to the church; nor does it always possess adequately the grace of self-effacement to push itself into the growing shadow of the church. Or perhaps it may be so eager to relinquish this power as to surrender it with too much precipitation, before the church is prepared to exercise wisely the power of self-direction. In South India there are Missions which delay too long the gift of even a moiety of self-direction to the church, while others have seriously retarded their own prosperity and the healthy development of the church by surrendering to it at too early a stage both ecclesiastical and administrative power. Perhaps the latter tendency is more manifest and common than the first mentioned in the older and well-developed Missions of South India.

Another question has reference to the ability of the Mission Church to change its ecclesiastical affiliation and especially to unite with other Indian Christian Churches in forming a United Native Church for India. This has already been freely granted, as we have seen, by some societies and denominations in the home lands to the Mission Churches founded and nourished by

them. It is a worthy form of self-abnegation which, however, must be guarded, lest it prove to be another way of contributing to the strength of other denominational missions. A few years ago an Anglican Bishop in India sought to establish with another Indian Church such a union of its churches. The consummation could have led to nothing else but the absorption of that Indian Church into the Church of England.

The crux of the present situation is found in connection with the administration of foreign funds. All agree that the Indian Church must have the right to administer all the money which it collects from its members. But shall it have the use and control of moneys sent to the mission from Europe and America? The Mission has hitherto been, in the main, regarded as the almoner of the Home Churches on the foreign field. When the missionaries have completed their work in a certain field and then have handed over their power to the Indian Church, shall the American or the British Church still continue to aid the foreign Church founded and hitherto nourished by it? Or shall it persist in sending its money only to support or aid work conducted by its missionaries? There is danger involved in any answer given to this question.

One would naturally say that a Mission Church, which is able to undertake entire self-direction, ought, as a corollary, to support itself and all its institutions. The continued use of foreign funds under those circumstances would pauperize the church and rob it of that virility and manly self-dependence and outgoing benevolence upon which its prosperity, not to say its very existence, must depend.

On the other hand, it should not be forgotten that in all the important missions of India institutions of learning and other forms of progressive Christian activity have been established, for the maintenance of which

Home Societies have been responsible. The Indian Church cannot possibly undertake at once, even if it ever can, the support of such agencies. How could they finance a great, unendowed college or an expensive hospital? These and other departments of work represent too great a financial responsibility. If all these are abandoned by the Home Church and Society and are left to the tender mercies of the poverty-stricken mission community, they must gradually fail and cease to exist.

One other problem may be mentioned here, which is greatly exercising missionaries and Christians in Japan and which will soon become of importance and urgency in India. In the relationship of the Mission and the Native Church, shall the Mission be under the Native Church or the Native Church be within the control of the Mission? As we have seen, the Mission Organization in India has wielded the power as its own specific right. There is little doubt but that the majority of missionaries would maintain that when the Mission has to become subject to the Native Church, it is clear evidence that the time for the disbanding of the Mission has arrived. If the Church has attained unto its majority and insists upon exercising all the rights of majority plus the control over its own parent, the Mission, it is evident that that Mission can no longer be of any aid to the Church and will render its highest service by its departure for other fields where it can undertake a new work for the Kingdom of Christ.

In conclusion, it is only necessary to add that the missionary enterprise, like all other great, far-reaching undertakings, is in a constant state of flux. It is forever passing on to new conquests by novel methods under the inspiration of fresh visions and with unfamiliar emphasis upon Gospel truths. Its world-wide object remains the same, though expressed by ever-changing forms. Loyalty to Christ has always been felt, but it

leads to actions and visions that are today widely removed from those of half a century ago. The widening horizon, the advance of civilization, the progressive Christian consciousness and its new vision of man's need and destiny and of God's nature and purposes—all these give to the missionary enterprise and outlook a novel aspect and bring to it a vigor, a hopefulness, an inspiration, and an assurance of success such as it never before enjoyed.

IMMORTALITY

HOWARD N. BROWN

I wish to begin what I have to say on this theme by frank acknowledgment that the idea of a future life often seems to me, as I suspect it has seemed to many reflective minds, all but unbelievable. It may be true, for all that, as many unbelievable things have turned out to be true. Indeed my present purpose is to argue as best I can that it is true. But I have to start with the recognition of a certain natural repugnance toward it, on the part of minds accustomed to look at things in the cold light of reason and common sense.

The case against it, as we are rather apt to look upon the life of the world, is almost conclusive; so strong that many now do not take the trouble to look much on the other side. So far as we can see, death is the total extinction of a human being. No hint comes to us at the moment of dissolution that anything survives the wreck of the physical frame. If there be a soul which escapes from that catastrophe unhurt, it is by some invisible way that wholly eludes our notice. To all appearance the life of a man is snuffed out, like a candle by the wind, and the lifeless body is left the sole remainder of what has been. When we try to think of the soul as a surviving entity, we almost inevitably ask where and how it continues to exist; and if we put these questions to our imagination, that faculty is apt to suffer total collapse. We are not accustomed to think of the air about us, or the ether above us as being peopled with invisible spirits; or, if we do endeavor to think that the souls of men "after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh" have the

freedom of these wide spaces, we do not easily conjecture what they should find to do there to make existence supportable.

Furthermore, though one may say with the Psalmist, "If God be for us who can be against us," we are quite apt now to make instinctive reference to Nature for an indication of the attitude of the universe toward us; and Nature appears to be absolutely indifferent whether we live or die. We are interlopers rather than otherwise, so far as her scheme of things is concerned. She does not take kindly to our improvements on what she has established. One is tempted to think, at times, that Nature would be willing to see the earth rid of our presence altogether, and there is not much suggestion that she would in any wise strain her resources to provide us more of existence than is here afforded us. On the whole, any healthful and honest mind is naturally disposed a good part of the time to be very much a skeptic with regard to a future life.

But there are several considerations that may properly induce us to distrust this unfavorable verdict. Some of our useful and matter-of-fact contrivances for utilizing the forces of Nature were absolutely incredible not so very long ago; and we are obliged to posit the existence in Nature of realities so strange to our experience that we have no language by which to describe them. When it is said of the ether of space, for example, that it is more solid than the most solid metal known to us, and yet so tenuous that planetary bodies move through it entirely without friction, there is an apparent contradiction of terms which it is very hard for reason to accept. Things may appear quite impossible to us, and yet we may be forced to acknowledge their validity.

It may occur to us also that whatever difficulty we have in making the idea of immortality seem probable and real, that difficulty has always existed for those who

were inclined to think seriously about the subject. It is perhaps somewhat harder for us than for men in other times to arrive at a positive conviction about the future life. But it never could have been easy for the more intelligent part of the world to reach hopeful assurance by a process of reasoning. And yet somehow men have believed; not the ignorant multitude only, but the philosophers. There must have been evidence not immediately apparent to the superficial sight, capable of making some weight against negative probabilities. I protest that when I consider what the fact of death appears to be in the common sight, and how people have always behaved in presence of that fact, the persistence of the belief in immortality seems to me to involve, in itself, a problem which current explanations are quite inadequate to solve. How did man, looking upon his dead, ever dare to form an expectation of a life to come? Why was not the thought of the soul's continued existence outfaced from the very first by sight of that which staggers our belief?

When we attempt to find the origin of religion in the mere crude theory of the savage or childish mind we ought to remember that, within the limits of our observation, a religion of pure theory never could be made to "go." I listen to explanations of the way in which primitive humanity was innocently led to ascribe the movement and growth of natural bodies to "spirits of the air," and I say to myself that after all this does not explain. There must have been some experience which supported this huge outgrowth and manifestation called religion in the early life of mankind. The men of those days must have found something better than mere conjecture with which to confront the great and ever-present fact of death. There is more to say of a probable basis in experience for the hope of immortality; though here I limit myself to affirming that it affords just pre-

text for deeper examination of the question than that on which our natural repugnance to it stands.

Above all, when we consider what the idea of an immortal life has stood for in the development of the higher moral qualities of our race, and what is likely to be the fortune and hazard of spiritual faculties when deprived of this alliance, we have motive enough for looking very carefully, and very far, before we yield altogether to that voice within us which says that the hope is most likely illusive.

We will not pause to elaborate this point; but I hold that nothing could well be more shallow than the sneer sometimes directed against those who will be good only for the lure and hire of heavenly bliss; and of all vain dreams, that of a wide-spread ethical culture which has given up religious hope seems to me, as the world now stands, one of the most baseless. That there are many people capable of making every sacrifice demanded by morality, though they believe that death ends all, one freely grants. But that the thought of a reckoning to come in another state of being has held a strong restraining influence over the vast majority of mankind, is scarcely to be called in question; and, knowing what men now are, I fancy no sensible person would like to see that influence withdrawn. Even when the moral life has reached a point where it can sustain itself temporarily without the help of such beliefs, it is still a question how long it will maintain its high enthusiasms and its peculiar valuations of conduct apart from religious idealism; and it is safe to say that very little worthy to bear the name of religion would long survive after the idea of immortality had perished.

Two great fundamental interests have always fed the religious aspirations and endeavors of men. One of these interests is that of securing help from unseen sources for the work and striving of our daily life here;

the other is the interest of seeing this life open into another and larger life to come. Of these two interests, I hold the latter to be by no means least. As human development is being shaped, I should say it might have to play quite the larger part in the religion of coming time. Certainly many of the ways in which religion formerly proposed to put man in alliance with spiritual powers for his worldly advantage are being gradually closed up. No longer in any civilized land do people much resort to their priests to ward off disease, or to secure a plenteous harvest. It is probable that in the more enlightened part of the Church of our day the thought of the hereafter is far more efficacious than the thought of immediate safety or prosperity by way of holding people to the religious customs of their fathers; though of course both interests may still be recognized. When we look the way the world is going and to the men and women who stand where the rest of mankind must slowly follow, it seems quite certain that religious discipline will be less valued as a means of securing advantage in the present race and warfare of life, and that the Church will have to live more and more on whatever assurance it can give of the reality of the idea of immortality.

Among the varied and conflicting opinions given as to the cause of weakness in religious institutions, and the prescriptions offered for building up their strength, it seems to me probable that their inability to convince the present world of the soul's immortality is at least a partial explanation of their failure to hold the attention of men; and that no device will enable them to recover their lost prestige till they can better answer the need of human nature at just this point.

We have much incentive, then, to look into this question to the uttermost, to treat it as a matter of supreme practical importance, and to let no small thing stand in

the way of such study of it as may bring to light every source of assured hope and reasonable probability. He who is aware of a certain skepticism in his mind with regard to the hereafter may well determine that this feeling shall not prevent most careful examination of every argument that can be presented in favor of the belief in a future life, or shut out any evidence that may possibly be found for its support. It is a question of such enormous moment and consequence that one can but lament the too common disposition of the educated mind at the present time to ignore it.

The main support of a reasonable belief in immortality is, I suppose, the apparent impossibility of constructing any rational scheme of existence without it. We are, to be sure, unable to prove that this is a rational universe; and some people appear to think that all things must be held in suspense until we can show the rationality of existence as a whole. But plainly all talk, of every kind, is vain and foolish unless we assume that we live in a rational world. We do assume that as a matter of course. If the assumption be nothing else, it is at least one of the necessary rules of the game, and we cannot play at all unless we hold to it. Thought itself is stricken with entire paralysis when it seriously entertains the supposition that the universe may not be built upon or proceed by any reasonable plan. If we are to continue to think about the world, we have to accept the hypothesis of its rationality.

But we cannot really see the world in a rational light without putting the thought of immortality into the general scheme of things. We can perhaps stop with saying that in some fashion unknown to us and entirely beyond our ken, the universe is able to justify itself as a reasonable creation. But since the whole effort of our minds is to find out what its reasonable order is, that unknown and undiscovered rationality of things is only

by some minute shade better than total irrationality. Objective existence is practically worthless, for our purposes, save as it presents itself to us in some reasonable aspect; and the world as a whole does not look reasonable, unless the human life that it contains is thought of as being prolonged into another state of being.

A world which goes through all the changes that this planet has experienced and expends all the energy that has here been put forth, with no resultant gain, is, in our sight, but a foolish kind of world; and nothing in its vast size as compared with our bulk, or its measureless antiquity as compared with our span of years, can shield it from that reproach. The stoutest faith imaginable in a supposed rationality of the whole of being can hardly support the plain folly and uselessness of such a long process of upbuilding, when the final end has nothing to show for the vast sum of effort expended. Our planet appears to be on its way toward the final extinction of its vital forces. If nowhere is any product of the huge machine being gathered and stored up, if in the end nothing is added to the sum of being by what has been here transacted, then life is not reasonable, as judged by any standard that we can apply to it.

Some attempt has been made to give it a reasonable appearance by supposing that as inferior orders of life have been forced to give way in part and yield to our control, so some superior kind of being will at last arise to put man under subjection to his rule. But this speculation does not amend the difficulty. In the first place, this superman would have to appear at once in overwhelming numbers, or we should probably kill him off in order to keep our headship of living things. In the next place, the speculation is of no use by way of helping us to the conception of a reasonable universe, unless we make the planet itself indestructible, and endow the superman, at least as a race, with earthly immortality.

The only possible way by which we can supply existence as we know it with a reasonable end is to carry our own life forward into another state of being. That gives to the life of the world a purpose, where otherwise no purpose can be discovered or imagined.

This, I should say, is the great argument in favor of immortality, and I am disposed to think that it has weighed more, all along, with the common mind than has the desire for continuance of life. It has been a good deal taken for granted that the wish was father to the belief, that men have wanted more life than this earth could afford them and therefore have formed the idea of another world to succeed this. No doubt such longing has played its part in building up the world's faith. But it appears to me rather easy to overestimate this factor of a composite result, and to ignore still stronger roots out of which the faith has grown. The desire for a future life is probably not so universal and not so strong as many seem to think. For one thing, the race has not imagination enough to dress the belief in any very attractive garb. The underworld of classic days must have presented rather a sad and dreary prospect to those who thought of it as a place of future abode, and the imagery which the Church has borrowed from the Book of Revelation has never made heaven seem so desirable that Christians were in any great hurry to get to it. To vast numbers of human beings life here has not been an exceedingly precious boon, and life hereafter has not extended to them a very welcome beckoning hand. On the whole, I doubt if the mere desire to have life prolonged has been as efficacious in producing faith as has been this other motive, to provide a reasonable view of existence and bring it within the compass of our understanding.

To be sure, man is, thus far, rather an emotional than a rational being. But he has rational instincts none the

less; and it is not required of the untrained mind that it should consciously think things out very far in order to sense a situation. It is so evidently the readiest way to provide the world with an intelligible meaning—to suppose that what we see here is the opening chapter of a drama to be completed elsewhere—as to warrant us in calling this inference one of the main supports of the common belief. Here, I think, has been with all classes of men a powerful answer to the natural skepticism of the common-sense view. There has been no getting away from it. Men have not had to grope after the idea that what they could see of life required some further unfolding for its explanation, but the idea has, so to speak, sought them and held them with a grasp they could not shake off. They could not choose but feel how inexplicable life was if the whole of it was under their eye, and their one resource was to push it forward for completion into an unseen world.

We have then, thus far, two strong impulses in human nature which tend to counteract each other. There is a certain tendency of the mind, looking upon the surface of things, to say, "This future cannot be. In sober truth, death for each one of us must be the end of all things." But there is something like an equal tendency of the rational part of our being to assert that it will not have the universe left a mere muddle upon its hands, and that the immortality of the soul is required to make sense out of existence.

One does not know how it would have fared with the idea of a future life if the matter had been left at the mercy of this opposition. But it has not been so left. We have spoken of some probable basis for this idea in the experience of our race. In our contemporary life there is a vast deal of what is assumed to be traffic with the unseen world; and one does not require to know much of history to be assured that, in all ages and from

the very first, that same traffic, or what passed for it, has been going on. Whether this experience was valid or fictitious, at all events vast numbers of human beings have believed it to be real; and that undoubtedly has had most to do with sustaining the idea of immortality. Spirits have been frequently seen, if we may credit what men in all times have said. Spirits have spoken, so that earthly ears could hear and understand; and this has been not mere vague rumor of something far off, but has been told on testimony that the uncritical mind at least knew not how to impeach.

Take, for example, the beginnings of our Christian faith. If anything was certain to the followers of Jesus during the first few years after his death it was that he had somehow risen from the dead. We can explain away what we please otherwise, but I do not see how their faith that he had been seen alive after his death on the cross is to be explained away. Not everybody, of course, credited the report of those witnesses who testified to this fact, but great numbers did; and it was out of this, in large measure, that the Christian religion got its start. Supernatural appearances, real or supposed, have been quite common in all lands. They are by no means rare at the present day; and it is this evidence of men's eyes and ears, however mistaken that evidence may have been, which has fed the world's belief.

One may doubt whether that belief, except as thus nourished, would ever have amounted to much among the possessions of the ordinary mind. Very probably it would have remained an uncertain speculation, hanging in suspense between positive and negative influences playing upon it, and never could have served as much inspiration or warning for men in their daily living. It has been some kind of experience with a life manifesting itself from the other side of the chasm of death, or what was taken so to be, that has given to faith in im-

mortality its most vital and quickening power. And this suggests the question whether we stand in any different case from the men who have gone before us; whether, in the absence of something that we can depend upon as real evidence of the life hereafter, belief in it is likely to have for people of our generation much more than a sort of academic interest. I am frank to express my own judgment that the idea is not likely to be of great consequence to the world of coming time, apart from some reinforcement of it by evidential means.

Most Christians, I suppose, if they believe at all, believe chiefly because they have not yet seriously doubted that Christ rose from the dead. But future generations are not likely to put so much dependence on that single incident. The idea must find a broader basis than that, in the experience of the race, in order to commend itself to people of scientific training and temper. This view of the case, that with us, as heretofore, something in the way of evidence is likely to be needed to put reality into the idea of a future life, lends considerable importance to a careful examination of what purports to be, in a measure, proof of the hereafter; to see whether or not it does contain anything on which the best reason can feel entitled to rely.

Yet that study, for some rather obscure reason, has found but little favor in the modern world. The Catholic Church undertakes to frown it down altogether; not on the ground that it is mere foolishness, but because the spirits with which one thus comes in contact are alleged to be wicked and depraved. One suspects that behind this objection there is an uneasy sense of insecurity about the Church's own hold on supernatural agencies, if they are brought under close critical study and review. For my part, I think I should not be so extremely particular about the moral character of spirits, if once I could be assured that they were spirits.

Orthodox science has poured much ridicule upon this undertaking, without adequate cause. It has chosen to take the position that the whole field to be investigated was nothing but a mass of preposterous illusions, and that only an untrustworthy intellect could think of finding there what was worth serious attention. But this judgment has been held without adequate information on the subject. It is an interesting field of study when one gets into it, whatever probable outcome the study may seem to have; and so many men of the highest eminence in science have now found in it the grounds of faith in a future life, that the charge of foolishness and irrelevance ought to be given up.

Having followed with some care, for quite a period of years, the literature of psychic research, I should like, in few words, to set forth my understanding of what its problem is and to what extent it has made headway in dealing with that problem. The phenomena that it undertakes to investigate may be briefly described as follows: first of all, there is a mind in what is called a state of "trance," which appears to be more or less akin to the hypnotic sleep. This mind is having a vivid dream, and is automatically talking or writing out that dream. Most of the dream is of no more consequence, so far as we can tell, than any other deliverance of one talking in his sleep. But now and then there is injected into the trance or dream an element that assumes absorbing interest. This element takes the form of an attempt to reveal personal identity on the part of people no longer living here on earth. Names (or parts of names), are given, which these people bore while in the flesh. Features are described and incidents are recalled, apparently in the endeavor to give assurance that the person to whom these appertain is still living. The problem centres in the question where this element in the alleged communications comes from.

A great deal of the disfavor which psychic research has had to encounter results from misunderstanding of what it is that the study seeks to investigate. It is objected that the supposed spirits have but little to say that makes sense, and say this little very badly. George Washington comes and not only manifests no improvement in his spelling but positive deterioration of his grammar. But no one need pay any attention to all this. It is probably nothing but the dream of the subconscious mind. If there be any communication from the other side, one can see from the records now accessible that it is a matter of extreme difficulty, and that it comes only in fragmentary form. It seems most probable also that only to slight extent can this communication come in words. It comes mainly, if at all, in the form of mental pictures, which the dreaming mind describes.

When societies for psychic research first began to publish reports of their proceedings, these reports, so far as they contained anything suggestive, were commonly dismissed as stories of fraud. The so-called medium, it was said, got up her facts beforehand, and gave them out in an assumed trance as messages from the dead. But as time has gone on that accusation has disappeared so far as psychic research is concerned, and it has now, so far as I know, no respectable backing. To one who knows of the safeguards adopted it is simply ridiculous. Another favorite way of accounting for what was striking in these messages was to attribute them to chance coincidence. But that also has been dropped by those who have much knowledge of what it is that requires to be accounted for. A random guess might hit upon a true incident here and there; but when it comes to a connected series of incidents, substantially true to life, the theory of chance cannot be strained that far.

The matter is now reduced to a simple alternative—"spirits or telepathy." The information that sometimes comes through the dreaming mind is either drawn from the minds of living people by some sort of telepathic process, or it is impressed upon that mind from a source quite outside our earthly life. Many are saying, "Of course it is telepathy." Now while I am quite ready to grant that this latter hypothesis cannot be shut out, I am by no means willing to admit that it is "of course" true. Nobody will say that, I think, but the one who wants it to be true. The most ardent champion of the spiritistic hypothesis can hardly claim that a demonstration of the reality of a future life has been made out of anything that psychic research puts before us. That is to say, no evidence that it has gathered thus far can be surely depended upon to convince dispassionate but doubtful minds. People who were before entirely skeptical have been converted by this means, and people too of no mean order of intellect; but it will not convince everybody, as it ought to do if it were a real demonstration.

What may be reasonably claimed, as I conceive, is that the spiritistic hypothesis fits the facts to be explained rather better than does the telepathic hypothesis. To begin with, the appeal to telepathy is about as much an appeal to the unknown as is the appeal to spirits. How any subconscious mind can gain such access to another's store of memories as this theory requires; above all, how it can make so good selection from that store of what is pertinent to the occasion, is quite beyond explanation. Such powers far transcend any gift that we know of as being normally within the mind's possession. Furthermore, information is sometimes given of which it seems quite impossible to imagine that it was taken from the minds of living people anywhere adjacent. If it was procured by telepathy, it must have

been procured across some hundreds of miles of space, and from people whom the subconscious mind never heard of. Then the facts fit very well with the spiritistic explanation, because what is given would so naturally come from that source; that is to say, the main effort appears to be directed toward the establishment of personal identity, which, if the process of communication were in anywise difficult and uncertain, would naturally be the first consideration.

Objection is sometimes made that if anything comes from the other side, it should be statements about the manner of life in that other world. I do not think so. In the first place, if, as I suppose, the foundation of the process is the impression upon the subconscious mind of a set of mental images, very likely that mind would be totally unable to receive or make anything of a set of images quite unfamiliar to it. In the next place, granted a line of communication through which was known to be unstable and inadequate, would not the first impulse of an intelligence at the other end of that line be to say, "I am here, this is I; and you may know it by such and such tokens!" One may say that this talk of a set of pictures put into the dreaming mind from an extraneous source is altogether conjectural. That is of course true; but there are the facts, calling for an explanation of some kind. All I say is that in the present state of our knowledge, the spiritistic explanation seems to me on the whole most reasonable.

What, for example, are we going to do with ghost stories of which the world is full, and which demand attention, one may say, if human testimony is good for anything, anywhere? That a spirit becomes visible, clad in the habiliments of earth, is to me unbelievable. But that a telepathic hallucination may be strong enough in our minds so that we may seem to see objectively what is only a subjective image, I hold to be quite credible. The only

kind of telepathy we know anything about, however, is that in which there is a sending as well as a receiving agent; and where should that sending agent be if not in another world?

Psychic research, I should say, has established a probability, larger or smaller as it may be estimated by different minds, that some intelligible sign may come back to us, who wait our turn, from those who have entered the mysteries of the spiritual world. To many this probability, what there is of it, has already proven of immeasurable worth as a confirmation of their feeling that this ought to be somehow a reasonable world, and a reinforcement of their hope that broken links of friendship and affection may be again reunited. I know not why others also should not find this value in it, would they take the trouble to inform themselves of the grounds on which it rests. Should this probability increase with the further accumulation of evidence, as I myself have considerable expectation that it will, one can see here a possible strengthening of the whole basis of religious confidence, not to be despised. Not much, if anything, need be now looked for by way of added knowledge as to what life, in that other state of being, is like. The channel is too slender and too flickering to support with any degree of certainty such communications. At best, we are much like those who listen where miners have been imprisoned in their underground caves, and hear some signs which lead us to conclude that they are still alive.

But I wish to plead that this in itself is greatly worth while. That much good can come from indiscriminate experiments in untrained hands seems improbable. But if a body of men possessing the requisite scientific equipment were, after due investigation, to reinforce the opinions I have here expressed, it could not fail to exert vast influence. I think that the studies which psychic

research has begun ought to be taken up and carried forward by a goodly number of dispassionate minds. Many investigations are being pursued at great expense along lines that promise far less for the higher life of our race. Psychic research, in my judgment, has a case to command respect from those who will give it candid examination, and one that is not going to remain forever smothered by mere contempt.

THE RUSSIAN DOUKHOBORS AND THEIR RELIGIOUS TEACHINGS

AURELIO PALMIERI

Of all European countries Russia is the most prolific in religious sects. Distrust of the Orthodox state church, on the one hand, which is regarded as too closely allied to the political power and unmindful of its duties to the people, and, on the other, religious ignorance with its consequent superstition, have given rise to innumerable sects, which range from religious nihilism to the most rigid traditionalism.

It has been justly said that Russian Christianity is, above all else, a ritual Christianity. It rarely penetrates to the hearts of its members, the recesses of the moral life of the individual. Its task, its mission, is social rather than individual, and, above all, is external: the pomp of the rites, the splendor of the ceremonies, the richness of the sacred vestments and ornaments, constitute the essential element in the religious life of the Russian people.

Against this general tendency of Russian orthodoxy have sprung up, through a spirit of reaction and under the influence of Protestantism, the rationalistic sects, which aim to rid Russian Christianity of its ritual dross, to bring into greater activity the inner life of religious feeling, and to establish direct relations between God and man without the mediation of pastors invested with a divine mission. These sects, in short, while not rejecting Christianity, propose to simplify it, to free it from its theological *patina*, so to speak, and to make its great principles effective in the life of society.

Among the rationalistic sects which in recent times have been eager to bring about a social transformation through a simplification of Christianity, doctrinal as well as ritual, the best known is that of the Doukhobors, or "Champions of the Spirit." Their tragic vicissitudes, the ringing appeals of Tolstoi to the civilized world in their behalf, the heroism of their attempts to effect a reconstruction of the social order which would overturn the foundations of modern society and establish the kingdom of God in the depths of every soul, have given them a wide reputation. In the present article I propose to narrate briefly the origin and history of the sect, and especially to set forth at somewhat greater length its religious teachings as given in authentic documents.

The name of the Doukhobors (Russian, *Doukhobortsy*) is derived from two Russian words, *dukh*, "spirit," and *borets*, "champion, contestant." Taken in a negative sense, the name may be interpreted as a striving *against* the Spirit; and in this sense it is used by the adversaries of the Doukhobors, who consider them as heretics who reject all the elements of the supernatural life of the church and the mysterious operation of the Holy Spirit in the soul through the instrumentality of the sacraments. The Doukhobors, on the contrary, interpret the name of the sect in a positive sense: they are the men who contend *for* the Spirit, its champions; that is, enemies of the external element of religion, preaching the worship of God in spirit and in truth. Their aim is to re-establish Christianity in its purity, to devote themselves to the service of the Spirit, and in it to make their own all the energies of the spiritual life. For this reason they also call themselves "the Sons of God," because the Spirit of God manifests itself in them with greater vigor. The designation "Doukhobortsy" was first used by Ambrose Serebrennikov, Archbishop of Ekaterinoslav, who died in 1792.

The historical origin of the Doukhobors is involved in dense obscurity. The leaders of the sect assert that their teachings are derived from the three Jewish youths (Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah) whom Nebuchadnezzar threw into the fiery furnace. It is possible, as Novicky supposes, that these youths symbolize the first preachers of the sectarian doctrine, Kuhlman and Nordman, who were burned alive at Moscow in 1689 for preaching the necessity of the second advent of Christ, or, perhaps, Demetrius Tveritinov, founder of a Russian sect at Moscow in 1713, who, with his followers, was condemned to perish at the stake.

According to a Doukhobor confession of faith presented in 1791 to Kakhovsky, governor of Ekaterinoslav, the cradle of the sect was in the village of Nikolskoe, or Nikolavevka, in the district of Pavlograd, government of Ekaterinoslav, and its first apostle was Sylvan Kolesnikov (1750–75).[1]

Kolesnikov cannot, however, be regarded as the first founder of the sect. About 1740 a former sergeant in the Prussian army in the village of Okhocee (district of Zmiev, province of Kharkov) preached the doctrine of the Quakers, closely resembling that of the Doukhobors.[2]

In 1737 there arose at Moscow another sect, which professed that a revelation was made by God immediately to each of its members, rejected the rites of the Church, ascribed to the sacraments a symbolical value only, and in its assemblies invoked the Holy Spirit. Whatever may be the case with these hypotheses, it is a fact that there is a close kinship between the doctrines of the English Quakers and those of the Doukhobors. We have, indeed, no knowledge of the way in which the religious teachings of the English sect were propagated in Russia;

[1] This document is published in the Cteniia (Lectures) of the Society of Russian History and Antiquities, associated with the University of Moscow, Vol. II (1871), pp. 26–79.

[2] Lenz, Commentationes de Duchoborcis (Dorpat, 1829), p. 9.

but it appears indubitable that the Doukhobors are one of the ramifications of English Quakerism, to whose doctrines in more recent times have been added elements derived from Tolstoi.

Toward the end of the 18th century, Doukhobors were scattered all over Russia, but their chief centres were in the governments of Kharkov, Ekaterinoslav, and Tambov. They are numerous also in the Ukraine, which Novicky regards as the cradle of the sect.[3] The Russian government treated them with the greatest severity, because it saw in their teachings the seeds of future social revolutions. In 1779 the Doukhobors among the Cossacks of the Don were exiled to Siberia; the same fate overtook those of Kharkov in 1793–94. Other Doukhobors were sentenced to flogging, to have their noses cut off, to confiscation of their goods; women as well as men had to endure this inhuman treatment.[4]

Under the rule of Alexander I, the condition of the Doukhobors was greatly ameliorated. Two senators, Lopukhin and Neledinski-Meletzky, appointed in 1801 to investigate the state of the Doukhobors, urged upon the Czar to mitigate the severity of the laws in regard to them. By a ukase of January 25, 1802, Alexander I decreed that the Doukhobors who had been banished to Siberia should be allowed, with a subsidy from the government, to establish themselves on the banks of the river Molotchnaia in the government of the Tauris. Another ukase (December 16, 1804) granted the same permission to the Doukhobors of the provinces of Tambov and Voroneje. This concentration of the adherents of the sect on the banks of the Molotchnaia lasted until 1821, when the Russian government forbade it.

[3] Livanov, The Molokans and the Doukhobors of Tambov in the 18th Century, Vsemirnyi Trud, Vol. III (1867), pp. 245–297; The Molokans and the Doukhobors in the Ukraine, Viestnik Evropy, Vol. X (1868), pp. 673–701; XII, pp. 809–836.

[4] Novicky, The Doukhobors. Their History and Religious Doctrines (Kiev, 1882), pp. 51–54.

The fertility of the soil and the mildness of the climate were so favorable to the growth of the Doukhobors that by 1808 they already possessed nine villages, Bogdanovka, Spasskoe, Troitzkoe, Terpienie, and Tambovka, on the banks of the river, Rodionovka, Efremovka, Gorieloe, and Kirillovka, near the lake of Molotchnaia. Terpienie was the religious centre of the sect, the residence of its head, Savelio Kapustin, who introduced community of goods and collective labor for his own benefit. From 1805 to 1820 the economic prosperity of the Doukhobors continually increased; the purity of their morals and their observance of the laws of the state gained them the favor of Alexander I, who abstained from persecuting them, although certain orthodox bishops, for instance, Job Potemkin, Archbishop of Ekaterinoslav (1812–13), tried to incite him to do so.

The situation changed under Nicolas I (1825–55), who, at the instigation of the orthodox clergy, renewed rigorous measures against the Doukhobors, and sent many of them to Siberia. A ukase of January 26, 1841, decreed that the colonists on the Molotchnaia should migrate to the government of Imeretia and settle in the district of Akhaltzykh in Transcaucasia. The Doukhobors stolidly accepted this decision, and between the years 1841 and 1845 five thousand of them migrated to that district. Here they built new villages, and exhibited marvellous endurance of the severity of the climate. The headship of the sect had passed into the hands of an energetic woman, Luceria Kalmykova, who called to her assistance in her mission a peasant, Peter Vasilevic Verighin. When she died, in 1886, she named Verighin as her successor.

The change of government in Russia in 1881, with the assassination of Alexander II, and the hostility of Pobiedonostzev, Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod, against all the Russian sects, provoked anew severe

measures against the Doukhobors. Peter Verighin and five prominent members of the sect were exiled to the government of Archangel; and since Verighin continued to direct the affairs of the sect from his exile, the Russian government banished him to one of the most desolate cities of Siberia, Obdorsk.[5] As he was passing through Moscow in 1894, before setting out for Siberia, Verighin received as a gift from Tolstoi that author's famous work *The Kingdom of God is Within You.* This book had a great influence on the subsequent development of the religious teachings of the sect. At the same time, Verighin advised his brother, Basil Verighin, who had come to visit him in Moscow, to counsel his fellow religionists to abstain from taking oaths, to refuse to serve in the army, not to participate in any act of violence, and to destroy their arms.

His counsels were put in practice. Some desertions occurred at Elisabetpol, Kars, Akhalkalaki, Tiflis, and Manglis. Other Doukhobors refused to render military service, or burned their arms. The Russian government replied to these acts of insubordination by first occupying the Doukhobor villages with some companies of Cossacks, and in the sequel compelling their inhabitants to migrate to Georgian villages in the districts of Duchet, Gory, Tionety, and Signakh. As they were allowed only three days to prepare for their departure, they were compelled to dispose of their cattle and their fields at prices greatly below their value.

Scattered through the Georgian villages, the Doukhobors had to suffer extreme privations from poverty and the rigor of the climate. Many of them became blind. In the space of three years, four hundred and fifty persons died. Believing themselves doomed to speedy extermination, they refrained from procreating children.

[5] Biriukov, The Doukhobors: collection of articles, reports, letters, and other documents, with a selection of their psalms (Moscow, 1908), pp. 65 f.

A report of their sufferings written in 1897 contains the following lamentable details: "In the Georgian villages the proprietors of the land demanded that the Doukhobors should labor for them almost for nothing, or be satisfied with a morsel of bread; and they, in conformity with their religious principles, made no complaint. Famine began to mow down its victims in their ranks. Furthermore, the authorities did not allow the dead to be buried in Christian cemeteries. There were cases in which the Doukhobors, expelled from their villages, died of want or of disease by the roadside, and the survivors had to drag the bodies with them because they were not permitted to bury them. They were, in fact, interred in the fields with the consent of the owners."

The sufferings of the Doukhobors had an echo in Russia. Tolstoi took up his pen in their defence. In a letter addressed to them in 1897 he congratulated them on the persecutions they were subjected to for Christ's cause. In another letter, of March 19, 1898, he turned to the civilized world and called for aid for a people of twelve thousand souls condemned to the most atrocious persecutions because of their zeal to put into effect the great principles of Christianity. In the same year, Peter Verighin, from his place of exile, wrote as follows to the Empress Alexandra Theodorovna: "I beseech you, O sister in Christ, Alexandra, to persuade your husband to put an end to this persecution of the Christians. The women and children suffer in our villages; hundreds of men languish in prison. We are guilty of but one offence—that of wishing to remain Christians. We have renounced the use of flesh, of wine, and of everything that tends to the corruption of morals. And if we do not kill animals, it is not strange that we do not admit the possibility of killing one of our own kind. The government demands of us that we learn the use of arms, that is to say, the trade of

murder. To these commands we will not yield. In the Caucasus we are hardly twenty thousand; consequently, we can inflict no loss on the government, even if we refuse to render military service. The best thing, therefore, would be for us to remove elsewhere, to a place where we can live unmolested."

Convinced that the Doukhobors were resolved to die rather than to give up their principles, the Russian government gave them permission to emigrate from Russia, on condition that they should remove at their own charges, and that they should never return.

By the aid of the financial and moral support given them by the English Quakers, the Doukhobors began to emigrate to the Island of Cyprus. The first company, consisting of 1,126 persons, disembarked there on August 26, 1898, and established themselves in the villages of Atalassa, Pergamos, and Kukhlia. The lands allotted to them were fertile, and the Doukhobors set themselves with feverish activity to cultivate them. But the unhealthy climate rendered all their exertions vain; in a few months fifty-one deaths occurred among them. The rest then asked to be allowed to emigrate to Canada.

The first company, about two thousand in number, arrived there in January, 1899, and directed their journey to the province of Manitoba. These came from the villages of Bogdanovka, Troitzkoe, Orlovka, Tambovka, Spasskoe, and Efremovka. A week later they were joined by nineteen hundred from the province of Kars and from the government of Elisabetpol. In June a thousand arrived from Cyprus, and, shortly after, two thousand more from the province of Kars; so that the whole number exceeded seven thousand. The cities of Selkirk and Winnipeg in Manitoba became their principal centres. On the lands assigned them they erected eight hundred houses.[6]

[6] Tversky, The Epic of the Doukhobors. St. Petersburg, 1900.

On February 27, 1900, Count Tolstoi sent them a letter, which is a formal invective against private property: "To gather together an individual fortune," he wrote, "and to keep it for one's self, is to do contrary to the will of God and to his laws." The Doukhobors made haste to put in practice Tolstoi's theories. On February 11, 1901, in a letter addressed to all nations, they protested against the laws of Canada. They declared that private property is a violation of the divine laws; that marriage and divorce do not fall under the jurisdiction of human laws; that the police and the state have no business to register births and deaths.

This letter was sent to the civil authorities of Canada also, October 14, 1900. The government replied, January 7, 1901, reminding the Doukhobors of the hospitality they had received, and declaring that it was not possible to change for them the general legislation.

In 1902, Peter Verighin arrived in Canada. The Doukhobors received him as a representative of divinity. He insisted on the necessity of the Doukhobors possessing all of their property in common, but at the same time restrained the zeal of some fanatics who wanted to turn loose their horses and cows because man has no right to compel them to labor as slaves.

Several hundreds of Doukhobors, released from their exile in Siberia, reached Canada in 1905, bringing up the whole number to about eight thousand. Under the direction of Peter Verighin they began to practise the community of goods, to cultivate their lands in common, and to distribute food in equal rations to the workers. In 1907, the government of Canada, in order to constrain the Doukhobors to submit to the general legislation, took away from them a large part of the lands which had been assigned them, and distributed it to immigrants of other nationalities. The allotments of land originally assigned to the Doukhobors at the rate

of a hundred and sixty acres to each family were cut down to fifteen acres. The Doukhobors made no protest, and declared that they had bought other lands to cultivate in common.

As Biriukov, one of their admirers, writes: "Their struggle with the world, with evils within and without, is not yet ended. Their ideal is infinite. The Doukhobors themselves recognize the relative feebleness of their powers, the remoteness of the goal they are seeking to attain. The forces of the contestants are not equal. The two parties are guided by different conceptions of life. On one side, the world, with its material enjoyments; on the other, the doctrine of Christ, which does not annul the eternal blessedness of the free spirit. On one side, death, on the other, life. To us Russians, these pure ideals of strong men, of modest workers, ought to be dear."

The investigation of the religious beliefs of the Doukhobors is rendered difficult by the scarcity of documents which give precise information about the doctrines professed by them. The principal documents relating to their teachings are the following:

1. The Confession of Faith of the Doukhobors of the province of Ekaterinoslav, sent in 1791 to the governor Kakhovsky. Novicky is inclined to think that this confession is to be attributed to the Malorussian philosopher Skovoroda.[7] This confession is a real little theological treatise, which discloses in its author a mind accustomed to constructive thinking.[8]

2. The colloquy between the archimandrite (later, metropolitan) Eugene Bolkhovitinov (1837) and two Doukhobors of Tambov, Matthew and Ermolaus Kuzmin. The colloquy took place in the monastery of Alexander

[7] Novicky, pp. 210 f.

[8] It is printed in the Cteniia of Moscow, Vol. V (1874), pp. 137–145; in the Vestnik Evropy, Vol. X (1868), pp. 697–700; and in the work of Butkevitch, Dukhobortsy (Kharkov, 1909), pp. 29–34.

Nevsky in St. Petersburg in 1802. Rather than an official exposition of the doctrine of the Doukhobors, the document records the personal opinions of those who took part in the conference.

3. An expository résumé of the teachings of the Doukhobors, composed in 1805 by the senator Lopukhin.[9]

4. The Catechism of the Doukhobors. There are two different redactions. One of them is ascribed to Count Tolstoi or to Prince Khilkov, and intersperses political and social aphorisms among religious maxims; the other is entitled *Principles of the Doctrine of the Doukhobors*, and contains two hundred and thirty-two questions and answers, divided into two tractates.[10]

5. The principal source, however, is the so-called *Living Book* of the Doukhobors, published by Bontch-Bronevitch, at St. Petersburg, 1909. By the title *Living Book* the Doukhobors designate oral tradition, that tradition which lives in their minds and in their hearts, and is contrasted with the Bible, the book of the dead. The book is composed of psalms woven together of verses and phrases from the Psalter, extracts from the Old and New Testaments, prayers and fragments of the Orthodox liturgical books, ideas and doctrines peculiar to the sect. These psalms, the Doukhobors say, are so many that they cannot be numbered. No single man, though endowed with the strongest mind, can learn them all. The book is therefore preserved in its entirety in the memory of the whole community; it is the complex of all their memories and all their hearts; it is handed down from generation to generation by word of mouth; fathers reveal it to their sons. It endures eternally, as the soul which comprises it in itself is eternal. It is incorruptible, and

[9] Characteristic Treatises of the Society of the Doukhobors. Cteniia, Vol. III (1861), pp. 3–16; Butkevitch, pp. 35–40.

[10] It is to be found in the Livanov's book, Raskolniki, I, 463–470; Butkevitch, pp. 41–56.

in this differs from the Bible, which contains an alteration of the teaching of Jesus Christ.

The origins of the *Living Book* go back to the beginnings of Christianity. The Evangelists report with many inaccuracies the teachings and deeds of Jesus Christ. Others, however, preferred to preserve in their hearts the treasures of the Christian revelation, and transmitted the same to the forefathers of the Doukhobors. Furthermore, Jesus Christ granted to the heads of the Doukhobors the authority to select the best passages in the Psalms of David and incorporate them in their book. He also watches over it, in order that the contents may not be changed.

The psalms of the *Living Book* contain paragraphs laudatory of the "divine race" of the Doukhobors, and contumelious language against the Orthodox Church, the author of all the persecutions of the "elect."

The *Living Book* is consequently the principal source of revealed doctrine. The Holy Scriptures are, on the contrary, considered to be as it were a dead book, the reading of which perverts the understanding. At the beginning of their existence, the Doukhobors not only did not contemn the holy books, but drew from them all that seemed in conformity with their beliefs; above all, the texts of the gospel were used to formulate moral teachings. Later the Bible ended by losing for them its importance altogether. The Doukhobors made an exception, nevertheless, for the Gospel of John, because they discovered in it traces of their doctrine of the Logos. They lay blame upon the Evangelists as falsifiers of the words of Jesus Christ. Moreover, the Bible is a dead book, which can never rise to the height of the living word which penetrates the soul.[11]

Further, the books of the Bible have not a literal sense. Many of the sacred narratives are simple moral allegories. Cain personifies the persecutors of the true

[11] Novicky, p. 246.

church; the confusion of tongues, the divisions of Christendom; the passage of the Red Sea, the final discomfiture of the devil; the miracle at Cana, the union of Jesus Christ with our souls, a union which transforms our tears into the sweetest wine. To understand the Holy Scriptures, moreover, the elect have no need of the teaching of the church. If the word of God lives in us, we necessarily feel its mysterious inflow. The individual interpretation of the Holy Scripture is nothing but the inner illumination of the spirit.

The Doukhobors reject the traditions also. The word of man does not deserve credence, whether that word be uttered by the Fathers, or whether it be enunciated by the Councils. The church has no power to judge men and condemn them to hell, because it does not know their individual sentiments and cannot know whether man's actions are prompted by self-love or love of God. God does not condemn those who through ignorance express their ideas badly or interpret badly the sacred books. Those sin who constrain their brethren to accept the teaching originating in their spirit, and believe themselves depositaries of revealed doctrines.

In regard to God, the Doukhobors admit that God exists from eternity; but before God wisdom exists. God dwells on Mount Zion, and Mount Zion is in the realm of faith. There was a time when the Word took refuge in the bosom of God, and God in the bosom of the Word. The idea of God dissolves in the theology of the Doukhobors in a mystical pantheism. Undoubtedly, in their catechism the Doukhobors acknowledge the unity and trinity of God, but in a sense different from that of Christian theology. The First Person is really God; the Second expresses the eager quest of the truth; the truth, then, is the Holy Spirit. The Father is the memory, the Son the reason, the Holy Spirit the will. The Father is the light, the Son the life, the Holy Spirit

the repose. The Father is the height, the Son the length, the Holy Spirit the depth. The first is the height, because it is impossible to conceive anything more exalted; the second is the breadth, because the reason roams in the fields of the infinite; the third is the depth, because human research cannot exhaust its mysteries.

The Trinity is real, because it is incarnated in the society of the elect; if the latter did not exist, God would be a myth. Man thus is identified with God; or rather God is the soul which is operative through three forces. Individuals are distinct elements of divinity, and for this reason the Doukhobors are called among themselves "Sons of God," and venerate one another. Each one has in his soul the spark of divinity.

The Doukhobors do not believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ. Jesus is the man in whom divine intelligence has revealed its fullest energies. Kapustin considered Jesus as a man who differed in no respect from other men, and about whose birth there was nothing supernatural. Jesus is the Son of God in the sense that he represents the divine wisdom. The accounts in the Gospel relating to the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus are to be understood in a mystical sense. The sick who were healed and the dead who were brought to life by Jesus are sinners. The death of Jesus was not voluntary, otherwise he would not have refused the cup of suffering. The resurrection of Jesus signifies that he is hidden in the souls of the elect. His body suffered the corruption of matter, but his spirit remained at first in the hearts of the Apostles, who were therefore called heavens, and then passed into the souls of the elect.

The Gospel is, as it were, a journal of our existence. Everything that is there narrated concerning Jesus is repeated in us, who are born, suffer, die, and rise again. Jesus is therefore the eternal gospel, living in men's

hearts. He is the word engraved upon our souls. His death does not involve the expiation of the sins of mankind. Jesus is a virtuous man, a son of God, one of the great heroes of the sect; and since he abides in the living recesses of our heart, the mission of the Holy Spirit is useless. In fact, the Doukhobors admit the existence of the Holy Spirit, but do not attribute to it any efficacy in the religious life of mankind. The sanctifying and vivifying power of the Spirit is reserved exclusively for Jesus Christ. The Doukhobors have also rejected the worship of the Virgin Mary, whom they revere only as a woman of eminent virtue.

According to the Doukhobors, human souls existed before the creation of the visible world. The fall of Adam and Eve is threefold: before the creation, after the creation, and in the life of the human race. The chief cause of the fall of the first man was self-love. The sin of Adam was not transmitted to his descendants. Every man is the responsible author of his own salvation or perdition. The sins of the fathers are not a hindrance to the salvation of the sons. Souls are infused into the bodies of children when the latter have attained an age which varies between six and fifteen years, and are sufficiently advanced to learn the psalms of the Doukhobors. After death, the souls of the bad pass into the bodies of brute beasts, and good souls into the bodies of righteous men. The souls of those who do not belong to the sect enter the bodies of unclean animals. When they have gone into the bodies of brutes, they no longer remember anything of their former existence.

The doctrine of the resurrection of the body is not clearly expressed in the Doukhobor confessions of faith. At the end of the world, Jesus Christ, with a human figure, accompanied by the female saints, will come to judge sinners, whom he will condemn to eternal punishment. The

righteous will remain with him on earth. The difference, accordingly, between the present and the future life of mankind will consist in the exclusion of sinners from the dominion of the earth. The righteous will continue to live on earth as they formerly did. But the world will not come to an end, because when the sinners have been cast out, the earth will be heaven. Heaven for the Doukhobors is synonymous with virtue.

Starting with the principle that before God every man must answer for his own deeds, the Doukhobors do not admit the salutary influence of prayers for the dead. They consider death as a change of state, and therefore do not bewail the loss of their dear ones. In the theology of the Doukhobors, the church is not a divine and visible institution, but the assemblage of those whom God chose from among men to guide them in the paths of his grace or of his life. These faithful ones are not bound together by an identical symbol of faith or by the same liturgical practices. They are scattered through the whole world, and assume diverse names, and have in their ranks even persons who do not profess the Christian religion. The very Jews who follow the inner inspiration of the Spirit and who do good are members of this invisible church. Hatred of the hierarchy is a characteristic mark of the sect. The priesthood is not necessary. Jesus is the only priest from whom we ought to expect our salvation. The priestly ministry may be fulfilled by any one who hears the call of the Lord. Successors of Jesus in his priesthood are the men who are pure in mind and body. For the exercise of the priestly ministry it is not necessary to have the permission of any authority whatever. An inward preparation suffices, namely, the illumination of the soul. The office of the priesthood does not consist in performing liturgical functions; the sacerdotal mission consists in the preaching of the word of God and in the conversion of the erring. The priest-

hood of the Orthodox Russian church mechanically celebrates its liturgical rites and repeats sacred discourses; but because it is not inwardly enlightened by God, its words fall on a barren soil. The people remains sunken in ignorance, and concerns itself solely about the external rites. The Orthodox priests, consequently, do not lead souls to salvation, and without warrant usurp to themselves the titles of fathers and teachers.[12]

If the priesthood is inward and the church invisible, the sacraments have no longer any reason for existing. They have a mystical significance. Baptism is useless, especially when it is conferred on children not yet come to the use of reason. The water of baptism bathes the body outwardly but does not purify the soul. By means of an inward baptism the soul is purified in the blood of Jesus Christ, renounces all evil ways, and repents of its misdeeds. The efficacious baptism is the putting away of one's own sins, a spiritual second birth.

There are seven baptisms, or seven spiritual rebirths: (1) The soul abandons its sins; (2) the soul recognizes the ways of the Lord; (3) the soul repeats the words of God; (4) the soul feels the spiritual anointing of prayers; (5) the soul inwardly confesses its faults; (6) the soul communes spiritually; (7) the soul mounts up to heaven by the martyrdom of sufferings or of mortification. He who receives this second baptism becomes superior to the angels, he lives with God, and besides his temporal name receives an eternal name which God will reveal to him in the other life. Those who have not been thus baptized are no different from dogs and cats, and will have no place either in heaven or in hell. The salvation of the soul is very rare: one man out of a thousand is saved, and one woman out of a million, for women are naturally stupid.[13]

[12] Livanov, pp. 84 f. [13] Novicky, p. 249.

Confirmation is a useless rite. Confession has no efficacy, for the church has no power to remit or to retain sins. True confession is spiritual, and consists in the penitence of the soul. The Doukhobors exact of their adherents public confession of their faults.

The communion also is rejected, on the ground that Jesus did not demand outward signs but the inward development of the powers of the soul. The bread and the wine enter through the mouth, but do not reach the heart. Jesus purifies us inwardly.

Marriage is contracted without special ceremonies. Parents ought not to hinder free love. The contracting parties must have attained the age of puberty, and they swear mutual fidelity in the presence of God. In many cases the wife is a mother before she comes to live with her husband. If a man abandons his wife after she has become a mother, he is expelled from the community. Divorce is allowed in case of adultery, and in such cases the children remain with the mother. After the death of one of the married pair, the survivor is at liberty to contract a second marriage and a third.

The religious worship of the Doukhobors is extremely simple, and corresponds to their dogmatic teachings. Churches are useless, because subject to decay. The true church is found in the soul, and of it the Doukhobors give a fantastic description. It has four walls: the first is formed by the Apostles; the second of the virgins; the third of the aged men; the fourth of the women and of the *myrrhophori* who went to search for Jesus in his tomb. The church has three doors: one for entrance, one for exit, and the third facing the west. It is filled with faithful servants of God, adorned with curtains, that is, sacred songs. There is in it oil in a goat's horn, and the goat's horn symbolizes the race of the elect. There is also a censer, namely, good deeds. The lighted coals signify the flames of desire, the word of God.

The altar in it is the asylum of true Christians. Upon it rest the sacred vessels, namely, the law of God; the gospel, that is Christ; the cross, whose four points symbolize the prophets, the apostles, the angels, and the archangels, respectively.

Though inimical to external forms of worship, the Doukhobors do not entirely suppress prayer. They have halls in which they gather to praise the Lord, empty and bare halls, with a plain wooden table in the middle. The members of the sect assemble there on festival days. The men take their places on the right, and the women on the left. After saluting one another in the name of the Lord, the first in the row of men on the right recites a psalm, to which the rest listen in silence. When the first psalm is finished, another psalm is recited by the second man, and so on in succession, first down the row of men and then down that of the women. The choice of the psalms is free, and each must recite his psalm from memory. Afterwards they sing, and during the song those present give one another the kiss of peace and bow thrice to each other in reverence of the divinity that is in them. The children prostrate themselves thrice before the aged. When this ceremony is over, the assembly dissolves, with a salutation to the Lord. There is no preacher to explain the psalms; every one is inwardly enlightened. After the service the children say the catechism together, while the adults converse on religious subjects and give vent to their antipathies toward the Orthodox Russian Church, which they call "*griekha*," or Church of the Sinners.

The Doukhobors have no special religious festivals. Outwardly, however, they observe the feast days of the Orthodox calendar, which they devote to collecting honey. They preserve the memory of many observances in honor of the Madonna, and celebrate Saint Flora and Saint Laura in the capacity of protectors of cattle.

The worship of images is, in the eyes of the Doukhobors, a very grave sin. They acknowledge the existence of angels and saints, but regard prayers addressed to them as useless, because every one must be saved by his own efforts. Among the saints who are revered by the Doukhobors as "Sons of God," the most important are Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, the three youths who were cast into the fiery furnace, the ancient prophets, the Apostles, and the martyrs of the sect.

The Doukhobors do not use the sign of the cross or any other outward manifestations of religion. Fasting is understood by them in a spiritual sense of abstaining from vice and from drunkenness. They have no special rites even for the burial of the dead. Those in the province of Melitopol confined themselves to singing over the fresh graves of their dear ones the following responsive hymn:

O Doves, with the deep blue wings!
We are not doves, we are not blue.
O Swans, white swans!
We are not swans, we are not white. We are angels, we are archangels; we soar through the world, the snowy world.
What do ye see? What do ye hear?
We see, we hear, how the soul separates from the body, how the soul takes its departure.
Forgive me, my body, my white body. I have lived in thee, have caressed thee, have flattered thy passions, have brought thee to punishment.
Go, O souls, go to Christ the Redeemer, and leave the poor body, leave it in its earthly resting-place.

As will be readily seen, this hymn is a dialogue between the soul, the body, and the angels.[14]

[14] Titov, The Sect of the Doukhobors, Missionerskoe Obozrienie, 1897, Vol. I, pp. 245–255, 377–388, 497–514; Kamenev, The Sect of the Doukhobors, St. Petersburg, 1905; Stavrov, The Sect of the Doukhobors: its Past and its Present, Khristianskoe Tchtenie, 1905, Vol. I, pp. 237–253, 386–396; Biriukov, The Doukhobors, Moscow, 1908; Butkevitch, The Doukhobors, Kharkov, 1909.

EXCAVATIONS IN PERSIA[1]

JOHN P. PETERS
St. Michael's Church, New York

From the head of the Persian Gulf extend two great plains, the one stretching northwestward along the Tigris and Euphrates, the other northeastward along the Karoun. These two plains constitute Turkish and Persian Arabistan respectively. They were the seat of one of the earliest and most highly developed civilizations of the world, or perhaps rather of two competing and rival civilizations. Once the region teemed with a vast population. Now it is largely desert. Both plains depend for their fertility not upon the rain, but upon the rivers which flow down from the mountains. When these were diked and dammed and carried every-whither by irrigating canals, the Babylonian plain and the steppe of Persian Arabistan were immensely fertile, capable of sustaining by their own products an enormous population. Now dikes and dams are broken and canals choked and the life-creating water runs to waste, part of the year causing inundations and turning vast regions into lakes and swamps, and the remainder of the time moving seaward through a single channel, shrunk far below its banks.

In ancient Babylonia there were at each succeeding epoch many famous cities, centres of political power or religious influence, such as Nippur, Erech, Eridu, Ur, Sippara, Babylon, Seleucia, Ctesiphon; and, in the Caliphate, Kufa and Baghdad and Bassorah. In the steppe of Persian Arabistan, on the other hand, there was but

[1] Le Palais de Darius Ier. A Suse Ve. Siècle Av. J. C. Simple Notice par M. L. Pillet, architecte diplomé par le Gouvernement. Paris (Geuthner), Mai, 1914.

one great dominating city, so far as we now know, from the earliest period to the time of its final destruction, namely, Susa. The site of this ancient capital was discovered by Loftus in 1851, when attached to the commission for the delimitation of the Persian-Turkish boundary. His excavations there, as at various Babylonian sites, while hasty and superficial, were remarkably successful, both in determining the names and locations of the ancient cities and also in furnishing valuable architectural and inscriptional material for more scientific study. After Loftus Susa lay fallow until 1884, when M. and Mme. Dieulafoy commenced the excavations which enriched the Louvre with those beautiful enamelled bricks, the frieze of the lions and the frieze of the archers.

It was the German excavations in Babylonia in the following decade which revealed the source of this branch of the ceramic art, carried to such a degree of excellence by the Persians, the manufacture of ornamental enamelled bricks, constituting friezes, representing animal and human figures, for the ornamentation of palaces, temples, and streets. The German explorers found such friezes in use in the Babylon of Nebuchadrezzar for the decoration of gateways and in the processional street of Ishtar. These friezes were composed of bricks of two sorts, representing an earlier and a later period of the art, separated only by a few years, evidence of the creation and development of the industry at that great period of Babylonian development. From Babylon the industry was transferred to Persia after the conquest, and it is the Persian Empire and its capital, Susa, which have furnished us with the most remarkable and the best developed specimens of this ceramic art. From the ancient Persians in turn the art was passed on to their successors, and until the seventeenth century certainly Persia and the Persians were famous for their tiles and glazed pottery.

The Dieulafoy excavations were remarkably successful in procuring for the Louvre picturesque museum articles, and in revealing the peculiar and barbaric magnificence of Persian art and architecture; but they yielded little of historical importance in the way of inscriptions of the Persian period and absolutely nothing from an earlier date. Even their architectural and artistic results, striking as they were, were imperfect. The excavation of the Persian palace was not completed, and from the Dieulafoy excavations it was impossible to restore it with any sort of detail.

On a voyage of observation in 1891 De Morgan, known at that time as an Egyptian explorer, became impressed with the importance of the site of Susa, and marked it as a place to be explored scientifically and completely. For this purpose and for other work to be achieved later in Persia, he developed a plan which won the support of the French government, and in 1897 the *Délégation Scientifique en Perse* was organized to undertake the investigation of the mounds of Susa, under a monopoly granted to the French government, by which France and France alone was empowered to conduct archaeological investigations in Persia. De Morgan found at Susa three principal mounds: the Mound of the Palace, on which Loftus and Dieulafoy had conducted their excavations; the Acropolis, on part of which stood an ancient Mohammedan shrine and place of pilgrimage, the Mosque of the Prophet Daniel; and a third hill, which he designates as the Mound of the Royal City, larger in extent than either of the other two. These three mounds almost surround a great open place which he designates as the *Place d'Armes*, or the Bazaar. The French commenced their excavations with the intention of permanence, and at the present time there stands on the Acropolis not only the Mosque of the Prophet Daniel, above referred to, but also a structure which might be mistaken for a mediaeval

Arabic castle, and which is really a stronghold—the combined fort, storehouse, and residence of the French explorers.

De Morgan's excavations have been remarkably successful in results and thoroughly scientific in method. The collections which the *Mission* has sent to France embrace not only monuments, inscriptions, objects of art, utensils and jewelry of every sort and every material, but palaeontological collections, geological collections, and collections in the field of natural history. Several halls in the Museum of the Louvre are full of historical and artistic objects found at Susa. A number of the prehistoric objects collected by the same *Mission* may be found in the Museum of St. Germain, while geological and natural history collections from the same source are exhibited in the Museum of Natural History and School of Mines in Paris.

No excavations have been more scientifically and elaborately conducted than those of De Morgan; and the French *Mission* has excelled all others in this, that the publication of results has followed discovery with remarkable rapidity. Inscriptions found have been transliterated and where possible deciphered, and text, transliteration, and translation published almost at once in noble quarto volumes, at a price and in a manner to make them accessible to scholars. Objects of art have been treated in a similar manner and put at the disposal of the artistic and archaeological world in facsimile and description at the earliest possible moment. Consequently it has been possible for the world of scholars to follow the French excavations and assist in their interpretation, as they have not been able to do elsewhere. The earlier English explorations in Assyria and Babylonia were conducted primarily with a view to securing objects for museums, and especially inscriptions, in which they were remarkably successful. The French from the

outset showed a greater inclination to conduct really scientific work, as witness the excavations of Thomas, Place, and Botta at Khorsabad, and Oppert's ill-fated scientific *mission* to Babylonia. Earlier excavations also even the singularly successful American expedition to Nippur, were spasmodic and hence able to explore but a small part of any one site; only the French explorations in Tello constituted a partial exception to this lack of continuity. The German excavations in Babylonia and Assyria, at Ashur, Babylon, and now at Erech, under the *Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft*, begun about twenty years ago, and the French excavations at Susa, under the *Délégation Scientifique en Perse*, mark a new era in the exploration of those regions, by their permanence and thoroughness, combined with their scientific methods.[2]

De Morgan's excavations have revealed to us the existence at Susa of a civilization as early as that of Babylonia. Before he began his work we knew indeed from Babylonian inscriptions of contests at an early period between Elam and Babylonia, confirming Bible references. Our idea of the Elamites had been, however, of a semi-barbarous, outside, hostile force, invading and overrunning Babylonia from time to time, as the Huns overran middle Europe or the Danes England, rather than of a people substantially in the same stage of civilization as the Babylonians, their rivals in the struggle for empire. We now recognize the Persian Arabistan and the Turkish Arabistan, to which must be added also Assyria, as parts of one larger civilization, competing and struggling with one another for the mastery, differing in language and in certain details of civilization precisely as Germans

[2] Such was the honorable rivalry of Germans and Frenchmen in the field of archaeology before the present unhappy war. That, it is to be feared, will put an end for many years, so far as those peoples are concerned, to the finer arts of peace, including explorations in Persia and Babylonia. All the more it behooves Americans to take up that work; and especially the Universities of Pennsylvania and Chicago should resume their long-suspended excavations in Babylonia.

and French differ from one another, not however in markedly different stages of civilization, the one semi-barbaric, the other cultured, but rather at about the same level.

De Morgan's excavations have given us our first real knowledge of the inhabitants of Elam, the country of which Susa was the capital, by the discovery, among their other remains, of numerous inscriptions, the so-called proto-Elamite, of the period before and about the time of the Babylonian Sargon, and the Elamite of the Kassite period, more than a thousand years later. Both classes of inscriptions make use of the cuneiform signs which were common property in Elam and Babylonia. These inscriptions show us movements of races and peoples in Elam as in Babylonia, now one race and one language dominant, now another, all using the same cuneiform script; and before that script was invented, the pottery displays the same shifting of peoples and culture, one replacing another, sometimes destroying, sometimes building upon its predecessor. The civilization of Elam as of Babylonia was composite, stratum upon stratum, and the excavations in the two regions reveal a practical identity of development, similar influences working at about the same time in each. At times Elam was the aggressive and dominant power, overrunning and exploiting or subduing Babylonia; at times it was beaten and pushed back. When Babylonia was united, it was stronger than Elam; but Elam had the advantage through all of its history of a relative unity under one great city, while Babylonia was mostly divided among a number of great cities, each struggling with the others for the mastery. So in general Elam was the aggressor; only when one city succeeded in dominating the rest in Babylonia were the Elamites driven out, or in their turn conquered. This was notably the case in the time of the great Hammurapi, who brought Babylon to the

front and united all the lower country of the Tigris and Euphrates into an empire more solid than any which had existed theretofore. He seems to have subjugated Elam utterly, but in doing so to have prepared the way for new invaders of Babylonia, and for a new race of Elamites. So when a couple of centuries later the weak Babylonian kings of his dynasty were supplanted by Kassites, Babylonia began to suffer once more from the invasions of Elamites, whose inscriptions show them, however, to have spoken a different language from their predecessors of a greater antiquity. It was only with the absorption of Babylonia in the great Assyrian Empire of the Sargonids that this Elam was finally subjugated and destroyed. The Assyrian great kings perceived that to maintain dominion in Babylonia they must not only drive the Elamites out of Babylonia, but must also conquer Elam itself. Even this, however, proved insufficient. Again and again Elam rose in revolt, alone or in conjunction with Babylonian insurgents, until at last, under Sennacherib and Ashurbanipal, Susa was utterly destroyed and blotted out. But by this policy of creating a vacuum the Assyrians in fact prepared the way for a new Elam, and for the final conquest of Babylon by Susa. They destroyed the buffer states to the east, which had held back the Iranian invasion.

It is after the fall of Assyria and the creation of the new Babylonian kingdom, under Nebuchadrezzar's weak successor in Babylon, Nabonidus, that Susa again comes to the front as the capital of the little kingdom of Ansan, the home of the conquering Cyrus; but it was Darius who first made it the capital of the Persian Empire. A new race now occupied the ancient site, inheriting the ancient civilization and the old cuneiform script. This latter they adapted to their language in such a way as to make it almost an alphabet, a procedure typical of their treatment of the entire civilization of the past which

they had inherited. Then for two centuries Elam was the centre of empire and the centre of oriental culture, until the conquest of Alexander the Great finally destroyed its glory. He seems to have applied the torch to Susa as to Ecbatana—at least the French investigations show nothing of importance at Susa after his time—and in the Parthian and Sassanian, as in the succeeding Arabic period, Darius' great palace was nothing but a place of interment for the dead. The Mohammedan conquest completed the desolation of Persian Arabistan, which had begun earlier with the Greek conquest. There was no population by which or for which to maintain the dikes and dams. There was no great city in the steppe, like Seleucia and Ctesiphon and Kufa and Baghdad in Babylonia, and so the Persian Arabistan was allowed to go to waste before its twin sister of the Tigris and Euphrates became the desert that it now is.

Because it was earlier laid waste, therefore certain remains of antiquity have been preserved in Susa which have apparently vanished from the older Babylonian cities, and indeed Susa has been the means of preserving some of the most precious Babylonian antiquities. In their invasions of Babylonia the Elamites at different periods carried off immense numbers of gods and goddesses, temple treasures containing objects of gold, electron, silver, and copper, and also priceless inscriptions. Numbers of these were recovered and returned to Babylonia at a later date, especially in the Assyrian invasions; others were destroyed along with the Elamite temples; others, however, were buried and thus preserved, in the destruction of those temples. The most famous and most important individual discovery, made by De Morgan at Susa in 1902, was that of Hammurapi's Code of Laws. This was a huge stele, some nine feet in height, which had been set up by Hammurapi in Sippara, dedicated to the Sun-God, the local deity of Sippara, who is

represented on the stele as imparting those laws to Hammurapi, much as in the Old Testament God is represented as imparting to Moses laws for the Hebrews. This is the most ancient code of laws yet discovered. It stood in the same relation to previous codes as in England the Laws of Alfred stood to older laws and customs. Hammurapi collated and made use of former codes, adding to them new laws adapted to present conditions, and thus laying the foundation of the jurisprudence of the Babylonian and Assyrian Empires and their dependencies. Apparently similar steles were erected in other places, but of these only the merest fragments have been recovered. All the others perished in one way or another. This stele, which was carried off by the Elamite invaders in the Kassite period, as the Germans carried away antiquities from Peking, was by that very act of vandalism strangely preserved for futurity.

Next in importance to this among individual objects found at Susa we should perhaps reckon the monument which depicts Naram Sin's expedition of conquest through and over the eastern mountains. This is a striking piece of work, promise of a development of the plastic and pictorial art which never reached fulfilment. It was carried off from Babylonia to adorn the great Elamite temple and thus preserved to us. When Ashurbanipal ravaged and destroyed Susa, he carried back numerous monuments and steles, as his predecessor Sennacherib had done, but fortunately not all. What they carried back is lost; what they left behind has been preserved. The Acropolis and the Tel of the Royal City yielded to the excavators stratum upon stratum of civilization, people following people, conquest after conquest, destruction and renewal, from a prehistoric period down to the Grecian era.

Quite otherwise was it with the Mound of the Royal Palace. Here, as at Khorsabad, the city of Sargon of

Assyria, a huge artificial mound had been built up above the level of the surrounding country, a sort of a concrete foundation of stones and gravel, firmly welded together, containing absolutely no antiquities, virgin soil in that regard, although artificially constructed. When Darius I made Susa his capital, he built this terrace in the same manner and on the same principle as the Assyrian kings of old had built like terraces for their palaces. The palace was half within, half without the city, a method of construction which prevailed in the east to a late date, as witness the famous palace of the Byzantine emperors at Constantinople. As in its foundation, so also in its superior construction Darius' palace resembled in general the palace of the Assyrian Sargon above referred to, and the constructions which the Germans have found in Babylonia. Darius was the heir not only of the Elamite, but also of the Assyrian-Babylonian civilization. So, in spite of the change of religion, from Babylonian to Persian-Zoroastrian, we find at the doors of Darius' palace guardian genii, curious sphinx-like creatures with human heads and winged lion bodies. Above these is exhibited the winged disc in Persian form, the symbol of Ormuzd; but the emblem of the Babylonian Marduk is also in evidence on the side walls. These genii and the divine symbols at the doorways were to guard the entrance against hostile spirits. We have also in Darius' palace the same long and narrow rooms as in the palace of Sargon at Khorsabad, grouped around courts. Some one hundred and ten rooms in all have been excavated, grouped about three larger and three smaller courts. The important passages and hallways in these groups were beautified by the friezes of enamelled bricks, to which reference has already so many times been made. The art of making such bricks was not known at the time of the construction of the Assyrian palaces, where the friezes were made of slabs of limestone or alabaster.

The friezes of enamelled, figured bricks are, as already stated, an inheritance and a development of the later Babylonian art of Nebuchadrezzar's period. In general at Susa as in Babylonia, architectural effect depended upon mass and color rather than form. The usual material of construction was unburned brick; but one exception there was to this, namely, the great throne hall, made of stone, utterly unlike in this respect any Babylonian structure with which we are familiar, or even the Assyrian palaces; in which latter stone was used, but, except in the matter of the colossal genii at the doors or statues here and there, only for purposes of facing, not as an independent building material, least of all in the form of columns. That is the special feature of this throne-hall, the Apadana. It is a hall of columns. In this it resembles the Persian remains at Persepolis. Naturally it has suffered more from vandalism than any other part of the palace. The stones have been excavated and broken in pieces. Little is left but foundations and fragments of columns, pediments and capitals here and there, by means of which and by comparison of the ruins of Persepolis, the skilful archaeologists and architects of the French *Mission* have restored the general plan and architectural design of this building; in which we find a divergence from and an advance upon the preceding architecture and art both of Assyria and Babylonia, a new contribution of the Persians, in the use of stone, and especially of stone columns, of a style and in a manner peculiar to themselves.

In connection with this great palace the explorers believe that they have found signs of a paradise or garden, such as is described in the biblical Book of Esther, as connected with the palace then occupied by King Xerxes. Oddly enough, the little brochure which has been put forth by M. Pillet as a sort of guide-book for the ordinary

man, and which is the excuse for this present notice, treats the Book of Esther as historical, and bases upon its statements and allusions some of the interpretation of the plan of the palace. Esther is really a book of very much later date than the time of Xerxes, and such traditions as it contains of Susa and its palace have passed through so many generations and such diverse hands that no biblical scholar of the present day would venture to base any scientific conclusions thereon. The relation of Esther to the Palace of Darius (which, built originally at about 500 B.C., was burned down in the time of Artaxerxes I, about 440, restored by Artaxerxes II, as inscriptions show, about 420, to be finally destroyed by fire in the time of Alexander the Great, about 323 B.C.) is practically the same as that of the Mosque of Daniel to the Acropolis on which it now stands.

With this exception M. Pillet's little brochure is scientific as well as illuminating and intensely interesting. Its object is to put before the ordinary reader a general description of the palace which Loftus began to explore in 1851, the excavation of which the Dieulafoys resumed in 1884, which was attacked again at the commencement of M. De Morgan's work in 1897 under M. Jéquier, and which was only finally completed, if such an excavation can ever be said to be complete, last year. This has not been the most fruitful or valuable part of the excavations in other regards, but architecturally the palace is the only building at Susa which it has been possible to restore with any degree of completeness.

The work is well illustrated, with various maps and plans and with some charming little sketches and photographs made by the author on the spot.

AFTER SIX DAYS: A NEW CLUE FOR GOSPEL CRITICS

BENJAMIN W. BACON

The conception of a preliminary period of ritual preparation for occasions of special sanctity is common to many religions, including that of the Old Testament, where the touching of holy things or coming into the divine presence requires a period of previous abstinence from anything involving ceremonial defilement. In 1 Sam. 21 5 and Ex. 19 10, 15 this period is of "three days." The longer period of "six days" is required for the supreme occasion when Moses meets Yahweh face to face on Sinai (Ex. 24 16), and this interval becomes as it were stereotyped in the most distinctive of Jewish institutions, the periodic seventh day "the sabbath of the Lord thy God," to which the preceding six days of toil lead up. The Jew labors and does all his work in the first six days of the week in order that he may rest and enjoy the fruit of his toil the seventh day, just as in the creation Yahweh's activity had led up to a period of satisfied contemplation of all that He had made as "very good." In like manner the later speculators of both Synagogue and Church expected the toil and turmoil of the six ages of "this world," each of one thousand years' duration, to lead up to the blessed repose and fruition of "the age to come," ushered in by the "thousand years" of Messiah.

To our modern view, which makes the holy day the beginning instead of the end and climax of the week, much of the forward look (if I may so express it) of the earlier practice is lost. To the Jew of New Testament

times every Friday was "Preparation"-day (παρασκευή).[1] He had in addition a special "Preparation"-day for every great feast, and a ritual observance to mark it (the *Kiddush*). The peculiar chronology of the Fourth Gospel seems in fact to make the year of the crucifixion one in which the "Preparation of the passover" (Jn. 19 14), i.e. Nisan 14, coincided with the regular weekly "Preparation" (ver. 31). It may be that the fourth evangelist is thus seeking harmony with his predecessors. At all events he shows the persistence of the Jewish institution of *Kiddush* or pre-sanctification.

We should expect, therefore, so long as this "forward look" survived in the hebdomadal calendar of the early Church, that the period of "six days," the regular interval between holy days, would have special significance, perhaps alternating with other expressions for the week, just as the *Hexaëmeros* of Philo (literally the "six-day" period) becomes the accepted symbolic phrase for Christian writers on the end of the world, because the millennium or great sabbath of God (Heb. 4 9–11) was expected to dawn when the world had completed six thousand years from the creation.

In point of fact, direct reference to a preparatory period of abstinence before great solemnities is by no means lacking in the very earliest records of the Church. The great Paschal controversy of the second century, breaking out on three successive occasions, and threatening in Irenaeus' time to disrupt the Asiatic from the Western church, was largely concerned with the duration of the preliminary fast which led up to the supreme feast of the Christian calendar. As Irenaeus wrote to Victor of Rome *ca.* 195 A.D.:

"The controversy is not only concerning the day (*i.e.* whether only a Lord's day should be observed as the Easter feast, or the Jewish

[1] In a personal letter Professor George F. Moore of Harvard kindly explains that the Greek term is a rendering of the Hebrew *hakanah*, which has no ritual or moral sense, but refers simply to the preparation of food for the sabbath.

Passover day on whatever day of the week it might fall), but also concerning the very manner of the [preceding] fast. For some think that they should fast one day, others two, yet others more."

This practice Irenaeus expressly says

"has not originated in our time, but long before, in that of our ancestors."

"Forty hours" seems to have been the minimum period of preliminary fasting. "A whole week" was the general practice of the Church in Epiphanius' day (385 A.D.),[2] which in our own has extended to the forty days of Lent. The *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, which was not far from contemporary with our own Matthew, reflects a system of fasting from the evening of the institution of the Supper to the Appearance to James (1 Cor. 15 3 f.), which this Gospel related as the first resurrection appearance to a disciple.[3] Unfortunately we cannot be sure what the interval was. At least it was more than the "forty hours" between Jesus' death and the bursting of the tomb. It may have coincided with the "three days and three nights" of Mt. 12 40, or may possibly have covered "a whole week." The passage has not merely the dubious attestation of Jerome, but is borrowed by him from the unimpeachable authority of Origen. Its bearing will be manifest to all who remember the importance attached in the second century to the correct observance of fasts and feasts, especially in the matter of time. After relating the appearance to James, the narrative continued:

"For James had vowed that he would eat no bread from that hour when he had drunk the cup of the Lord until he should see him rising from those that sleep."

[2] Panar. 1, 1, 3; lxx, 12.

[3] It is preceded by a leaving of the sindōn (linen sheet) by the Risen One "with the servant of the high priest," doubtless as a testimony unto them. Had this Gospel a different version of Mk. 14 51 f., representing the loser of the sindōn as one of the servants of the high priest?

It related next the Lord's loosing of the vow of abstinence:

"Bring a table, said the Lord, and bread," and added: "He took the bread, and blessed and brake it, and gave to James the Just, and said unto him: My brother, eat thy bread; for the Son of man is risen from among them that sleep."

Had we more of this fragment of the Palestinian Gospel we should probably be able to say just how long a period of fasting before the Easter feast was commended by the example of the Lord's brother in the interval between his "drinking the cup of the Lord" and being commanded to break his fast. As it is, we can only note the ritual interest and phraseology of the fragment, and its extremely early attestation to the observance of the preparatory days of fasting, whether three or more in number.[4]

Almost equally early and wide-spread is the attestation to the observance of a preliminary period of fasting before administration of baptism, the Church's other great sacrament. The *Teaching of the Twelve* (100–125 A.D.) is explicit in its prescription of "one or two days" of preliminary fasting before baptism (vii, 4), and in the Clementine writings this is treated as equally indispensable. In Tertullian's day (210 A.D.) the preliminary days before baptism were occupied with catechetic teaching, prayers, vigils, and fasting. *After* the baptism there was further observance of a retrospective or commemorative character. The neophyte observed a week of abstinence from washing of hands and face (*abstinentia a lavacro*).

[4] It would be precarious to suggest a connection between Ev. Petri, vii, 26 f. and the preparatory fast. The passage reads: "And I [Peter] with my companions was grieved, and wounded to the heart we hid ourselves, for we were sought by them as malefactors, and as desiring to burn the temple. And on account of all these things we were fasting, and sat mourning and weeping night and day until the sabbath." If there be connection, it implies observance of the fast only on Good Friday. It is broken off by the sabbath, regardless of the fact that the disciples are still "weeping and grieving" (xiv, 59) at the end of the feast of unleavened bread, ignorant of what has transpired at the sepulchre "during the night of the dawn of the Lord's day" (ix, 35).

As we shall see, the tendency was strong to concentrate baptisms so far as possible on a particular date, just as observance of the Lord's Supper was focussed at the celebration at Easter. The date for baptisms was the feast of Epiphany or Twelfth Night, i.e. the night of January 5–6, twelfth from the feast of the Nativity (December 24–25). This was the second greatest feast of the ecclesiastical year, commemorating the Baptism of Jesus, or as the name "Epiphany" implies the "Manifestation" of his glory. In later liturgies, such as the Mozarabic, the week preceding Epiphany is occupied with such preparatory observances as Tertullian prescribes for baptism.

The question for us to determine is whether these religious observances are not in part even older than Christianity, and whether some traces of them may not be found on the pages of our own canonical Gospels, as well as in writings which though uncanonical are substantially contemporary.

In the Preface to my *Beginnings of Gospel Story* (1909, page ix), I urged application in gospel criticism and interpretation of a method to be termed "aetiological," because based on the working hypothesis that

> "The motive of the biblical writers in reporting the tradition current around them is never strictly historical, but always aetiological, and frequently apologetic. . . . The evangelic tradition consists of so and so many anecdotes, told and retold *for the purpose of explaining or defending beliefs and practices of the contemporary Church.*"

The first requirement under this method would therefore be a study of early ritual and belief, on the theory that ritual reflects the significance found *anciently* in the narrative. Its form, if not sometimes its origin, would presumably be due to the observance, in cases where we have reason to regard the observance as older than the extant form of the story. The methods and data of the historian of religion are here peculiarly serviceable in view of the well-known fact of the survival

in Christianity of earlier religious observances both Jewish and Pagan.

The method is not altogether new. An example of "aetiological" interpretation in common application occurs in the correspondence commentators justly note between the successive features of the Feeding of the Multitude, as related no less than six times in the Gospels, and the ritual of the *Agapé*. In both we have (1) orderly arrangement of the multitude at evening, (2) blessing and breaking of the bread by the presiding minister, (3) distribution of the food, (4) collection of the remnants by the deacons or almoners.

A further instance may be found in the Easter observances to which reference has already been made. In my volume just cited on page xxix, in speaking of the special form of evangelic tradition current at Rome in the time of our oldest Gospel (Mark, 75–80 A.D.), appeal is made to our knowledge from the "Paschal" controversies of the second century of the chronological difference between Roman and Asiatic practice—a matter of vital importance for the feeling of the period.[5] The difference was already of long standing when Polycarp visited Anicetus in Rome (*ca.* 150 A.D.); the East claiming (with good reason) the sanction of apostolic practice for celebrating the "fourteenth" Nisan (whence the name "Quartodeciman") with "the [Jewish] people," regardless of the day of the week. The West held it abhorrent "to celebrate the sacred mystery of the Resurrection on any other than the Lord's day."

Now the (Roman) Gospel of Mark has a remarkable series of exact notations of time covering the whole period of the Passion story—and no other—from the

[5] Thus Peter, Bishop of Alexandria (*ca.* 300), quotes a Quartodeciman Trecentius: "We have no other purpose than to keep the memory of his [Christ's] passion, and at the time when those who from the beginning were eye-witnesses have handed down." Cited by Drummond, Authorship and Character of Fourth Gospel, 1904, p. 477.

Anointing "in Bethany in the house of Simon the Leper" (Mk. 14 1-3) to the Resurrection. Moreover the time is divided more minutely and exactly in proportion as the culminating periods of ritual observance are approached. The night of Vigil in Gethsemane, corresponding to the vigil of Passover (Ex. 12 42), and the day of the Crucifixion are even divided into quarters, or "watches," of three hours each (Mk. 14 17, 41, 72; 15 1, 25, 33, 34, 42), each marked by its own significant event. Knowledge of the importance anciently attached to (chronologically) correct observance of the Easter vigil,[6] fast, and feast, suggests that these precise notes of time are made by the (Roman) evangelist in the interest of ritual.

Thus on the eve of Good Friday "at evening" (Mk. 14 17) the Church celebrates its "Passover of the Lord." Mark's narrative and its parallels explicitly note at the close (ver. 25) that henceforth the observance is made "new in the kingdom of God." The closing "hymn" receives particular mention (ver. 26). Through the midnight watches the Church keeps its Passover vigil[7] (Ex. 12 42), remembering the boastful word of Peter, and his denial of his Lord "at cock-crowing." The command "Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation" emphasized by the contrast of Jesus with the sleeping disciples, and by the remorse of unfaithful Peter, occupies the salient point of the story (14 38, 72). Thus again "at dawn" of the following day (Good Friday), the Church recalls the "good Confession witnessed before Pontius Pilate." The second watch is marked by the Crucifixion "at the third hour."[8] Next, at the midday

[6] See above, note 5.

[7] See the chapter on "Quartodecimanism" in my Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate, 1910, pp. 412–439. The vigil with its readings from the Gospels (διανυκτερεύοντες ἐν ἀναγνώσεσι) formed a constant feature of the observance, while debate raged as to time and duration of the fasting.

[8] The Fourth Gospel particularly specifies the sentence to the cross as given "at the sixth hour," Jn. 19 14.

watch, comes the Darkness "at the sixth until the ninth hour," with the parting cry "at the ninth hour." The fourth watch ends with the Burial "when even [sunset] was now come, it being the Preparation" [Friday].

The strongest proof that these exact notes of time in the Synoptic (i.e. Markan) passion story are really made in the interest of ritual is the singular contrast afforded by the Fourth Gospel. This narrative has almost equally minute notation for the chronology of the passion period, but follows a different and irreconcilable system. In John we have datings not by days of the week (cf. Mk. 15 42), but by days of the (lunar) month (Nisan). The reckoning begins as in Mark with the Anointing (Jn. 12 1 ff. = Mk. 14 1 ff.); only according to John this—or rather the Arrival in Bethany, sunset marking the beginning of a new day—occurs not two but *six* days before the passover. Doubtless Epiphanius[9] is correct in connecting the story of the Anointing (five days before passover according to Jn. 12 2) with the Mosaic law for the "setting apart of the passover lamb" (Ex. 12 3). Jewish ritual fixes this observance in fact "on the tenth day" (of Nisan), i.e. five days before the passover. Quartodecimans, who observed Easter coincidently with the Jewish feast, and prided themselves on their conformity herein to "the [Mosaic] law," "took the sheep from the tenth day, recognizing the name of Jesus from the *iota*" (i.e. the I of Ἰησοῦς, in numerical value = 10).[10] Fortunately the *Syriac Didascalia* affords positive confirmation of this obscure intimation of Epiphanius, by declaring (c. xxi) that "on Monday *tenth of Nisan* Jesus was in the house of Simon the Leper" (cf. Mk. 14 3 with Jn. 12 1 f.).

The Johannine paschal datings continue (12 12) with the Triumphal Entry "on the morrow" (Nisan 11?),

[9] Panar. l, 3. [10] Epiphanius ibid.

PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

followed (Nisan 12?) by a Withdrawal (12 36), which concludes the public ministry. Jesus is henceforth with "his own." Whatever uncertainty might exist as to the dating of Entry and Withdrawal is corrected in the next note of time; for when the story resumes (13 1 ff.) it is still "before the passover" (Nisan 13). The Foot-washing "after supper" marks the beginning of the great day when "Christ our passover also hath been sacrificed" (Nisan 14—slaughter of the lambs), while "the third day" after (Nisan 16, i.e. "Firstfruits") is the day on which Christ rose "and became the Firstfruits of them that slept." The *hexaëmeros* begins with the Anointing (Nisan 10), and culminates with the Resurrection (Nisan 16).

So for the special day of vigil and fasting (Good Friday). As in Synoptic tradition, the whole period is divided in John also, but less minutely and on a different plan. The night of vigil seems to be spent in discourse and prayer until the coming of the betrayer, though there is no mention of a command to watch, or of the disciples' failure to live up to it, but only of Peter's Denial, which is of course, by implication, at cock-crowing.[11] "At dawn" (18 28) comes the Confession before Pilate, accompanied by a second positive intimation that the passover feast is still to be celebrated (28 *b*). "The sixth hour" (midday) is marked (19 14), contrary to Synoptic tradition (cf. Mk. 15 25), as that of the fateful Sentence to the Cross; but there is no further note of time till the day closes with the burial at sunset. Then we learn that it was "the Jews' Preparation" (Friday). The following day, we are told (19 31), was "a high day," which would of course follow from its being both a sabbath (by weekly reckoning) and also

[11] Peculiarly strong evidence exists both textual and structural for regarding this episode as well as its reflection in the Appendix (Jn. 21 15-19) as a supplement to the earliest form of this Gospel.

First of Unleavened Bread (Nisan 15). There is no further note of time until the Resurrection before dawn "on the first day of the week" (19 42; 20 1).

But to return to our *hexaëmeros*, whose beginning is so distinctly marked in Jn. 12 1 as "six days before passover." The Crucifixion, as we have seen, coincides with the slaughter of the passover lambs in the evening of Nisan 14, the Resurrection with the offering of "first-fruits" of the new harvest on Nisan 16. This coincidence is no fancy of the modern critic, but corresponds, as ancient Quartodecimans pointed out, with the two figures of Paul in First Corinthians. Writing at the season of Passover (16 9) he exhorts the Corinthians first (1 Cor. 5 7 f.) to "put away the old leaven[12] . . . for Christ our passover is sacrificed for us"; again he declares (15 20, 23, 36 f.): "Now is Christ risen from the dead—like the new corn from the seed—and become the 'first-fruits' of them that slept." The latter of these two figures is adopted in full by our evangelist (Jn. 12 24). The very foundation of ancient Quartodeciman reasoning was this correspondence of the Passion dates with the Mosaic festal calendar. Quartodecimans pointed out that

"The resurrection is a further witness (to the observance of Nisan 14). In point of fact (γοῦν) [Christ] rose on the third day, which is the first day of the season of the [seven] weeks of harvest, the day on which it was commanded the priest to offer the sheaf."[13]

Epiphanius (375 A.D.) found a way of harmonizing Synoptic with Johannine chronology by rendering Lk. 22 7 "the day of unleavened bread came, on which they *should have* sacrificed the passover" (i.e. unleavened

[12] Putting away the old leaven is the ceremony which marks midday of Nisan 14 in the Jewish ritual. Hence the expression "the fourteenth, the day on which the [Jewish] people put away the leaven," in Polycrates of Ephesus (195 A.D.).

[13] Clement of Alex. Fragment in Paschal Chron.

bread—Nisan 15—came on, which the Jews, by error, had counted as Nisan 14 when the lambs are sacrificed).[14] The fault which he finds with the Quartodecimans is that they do not go far enough with their conformation to the Mosaic law. They confined their celebration to a single day; whereas they ought to have chosen the sheep on the tenth day, and so fasted for five days, thus conforming to the general practice of the Church in *celebrating a whole week* (i.e. until Firstfruits, Nisan 16).[15]

In a word the passion-chronology of the Fourth Gospel is in the main carefully adapted to the ritual practice which the Quartodecimans of Asia insisted they had received in unbroken tradition from the apostles. It justifies reckoning the chief date "with the [Jewish] people"; but it also "celebrates a whole week." It makes the Anointing in Bethany correspond with the Setting apart of the Lamb on Nisan 10, the Crucifixion with the Slaughter of the Lamb at evening of Nisan 14, and the Resurrection with Firstfruits on Nisan 16.

On the other hand, it seeks a maximum of agreement with Synoptic tradition by the statement (19 31) that "the day of that sabbath was a high day." This establishes also the *weekly* fast and feast of primitive Christian practice (cf. Mk. 2 20; 16 2), and produces a partial harmony by assuming that "the Preparation of the passover" (19 14) happened *in that particular year* to be also "the Jews' Preparation" (i.e. a Friday), so that the ensuing sabbath would be not only the seventh day of the week, but doubly sacred because also the "first day of unleavened bread" (Nisan 15). "First-

[14] This harmonistic device is by no means original with Epiphanius. Eusebius had previously employed it and even the Quartodecimans of the second century accuse their opponents of "making the Gospels conflict," besides not obeying the (Mosaic) law. Irenaeus, who opposed the Quartodecimans, had a reverse system of harmonizing, adapting the Johannine to Synoptic chronology; but he does not explain how (Haer. II, xxii, 3).

[15] Panar. l, 1, 3; lxx, 12.

fruits" on the morrow would therefore fall on "the first day of the week."

The *Syriac Didascalia* thus appears to be justified in reckoning the Anointing as "*on Monday* tenth of Nisan," which implies the Royal Entry on Tuesday(?), Withdrawal on Wednesday (?), Footwashing on Thursday, followed by Vigil (in the Upper Room), Betrayal and Crucifixion on Friday, Rest in the grave on the Sabbath, and Resurrection on Sunday.

Now if modern critics and commentators on the Synoptic tradition, such as Heitmüller, are correct in speaking of a Markan "scheme of six days" for passion week,[16] it doubtless is intended to begin, like the Johannine, with Monday; though in Synoptic tradition not the Anointing in Bethany, but the Royal Entry (Mk. 11 1–11) signalizes the day. We have thus in *both* traditions a six-day period or *hexaëmeros* leading up to the great anniversary of the Resurrection. It is important to observe, however, that the fundamental reckoning of the fourth evangelist is annual, while the coincidence of week-days is merely harmonistic and incidental. The disciple who celebrated Holy Week according to the calendar of the Fourth Gospel would keep the Lord's Passover "on the day that the [Jewish] people put away the leaven"[17] (Nisan 14). This coincidence with the Jewish feast would occur *every* year. He would *occasionally* find himself in coincidence with Christians of Western observance of Easter, i.e. whenever Nisan 14 happened to fall on Friday. Both traditions, Synoptic as well as Johannine, outline the events of passion week under a "scheme of six days."

There is important confirmation of the "aetiological" method and of the results already outlined, besides a great intrinsic interest, in observing how the fourth evan-

[16] Heitmüller, Jesus, 1913, p. 58.

[17] The expression of Polycrates of Ephesus (195 A.D.).

gelist has prefaced his story of the public ministry of Jesus with another *hexaëmeros* of the Master with his disciples. This sequence of days has even the appearance of leading over into the peculiar chronology of John, in much the same way that the *hexaëmeros* of the Priestly Writer of the Pentateuch in Gen. 1 1–2 4 leads over into the chronological system of the sacerdotal law. In this case the feast is that which Chrysostom designates "the first [i.e. of the year], Epiphany." It was especially honored in the East, and was in fact the counterpart of Easter, having among its other functions that of the sending out from Alexandria of the famous annual "Paschal letters," which fixed the ecclesiastical calendar for the year.

Every observant reader is struck at once on comparing the Johannine with the earlier Gospels by the large place the fourth evangelist gives, after the Prologue, to a Self-revelation of Jesus to his Disciples at the Baptism of John (Jn. 1 19–2 11). This self-revelation is described as occurring in a sequence of six days and culminates in the Miracle at Cana of Galilee on the seventh. In fact from the point where the Baptist bears his "witness that this is the Son of God" and points Jesus out as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," down to the "manifestation of his glory" which convinces the disciples in Cana, we have in this series of presentations of Jesus in his various messianic functions a complete anticipation of the Synoptic story of the Confession of Peter, Prediction of the Cross, Promise of the *Parousia* and Transfiguration (Mk. 8 27–9 8 and parallels).

Were we to classify the Gospels in accordance with our knowledge of early ritual observance in the Church, we should characterize the Fourth, which begins with the *manifestation* of Jesus to be the Son of God, as an "Epiphany" Gospel; whereas Matthew and Luke, each of which prefixes to Mark an account of Jesus' miraculous birth,

should be called "Nativity" Gospels. Mark is the common starting-point; but its statement of the divine sonship is manifestly regarded by all as inadequate, Matthew and Luke developing in one direction, John in the other. The development of ritual has light to throw upon the matter.

Ancient observance wavered between the *dies natalis*, and the *dies natalis virtutum domini*. The Gnostic sects even observed the date of Jesus' baptism by John as the "birthday of the Saviour" (γενέθλια τοῦ Σωτῆρος), because, as they maintained,

> "It was not till [the *Aeon*] Christ descended into Jesus (Mk. 1 10 f.) that he began to do miracles and to heal and reveal the unknown Father, and declare himself openly the Son of the first man."[18]

The earlier Gnostics naturally admitted only the Gospel of Mark.[19] Later they gladly availed themselves of the Gospel of John. The Church catholic, on the other hand, in its two more recent Gospels of Matthew and Luke, had meantime supplied the deficiencies of Mark, removing by means of their accounts of Jesus' birth as "Son of God" (Lk. 1 35) the opportunity Mark had afforded to interpret the title "Son of God" in a Docetic or Adoptionist sense. This effort to counteract Gnostic tendencies in the later Synoptic Gospels, also reflected in the second clause of the Apostles' Creed, appears again in very marked degree in the development of ritual observance. The orthodox (especially in the West) emphasized the Nativity, and deprecated the Gnostic disposition to magnify Epiphany as the significant feast. Thus the eighteenth of the letters of Leo (440–481 A.D.) protests to the Sicilian bishops against the tendency there prevalent to regard the baptism of Jesus as having borne the same import for him and conveyed the same grace as the baptism of believers to them. Pope

[18] Irenaeus, Haer. I, xxx, 13. Specifically "Cerinthus" in xxvi, 1.

[19] Irenaeus, Haer. III, xi, 7.

Siricius (385) had protested against the custom of baptizing at Epiphany for this same reason. At first in the East the Nativity was celebrated on the same day as the Feast of the Baptism (January 6), the ancient Feast of the Epiphany of Dionysus. Later in Rome and the West it was celebrated on December 25, the Julian winter solstice, or *dies invicti solis*. This Roman date gradually took the place of January 6, so that Epiphanius even goes so far as to fix a new date (November 8) for the Baptism. To quote (in abstract) the clear and scholarly article of Professor Kirsopp Lake ("Epiphany" in the *Dictionary of Religion and Ethics*):

"In the fourth century in Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, and probably elsewhere, before December 25th had been accepted as the date of the Nativity, January 6th was observed as the feast *both* of the Nativity and the Baptism. Silvia's account of her pilgrimage (325 A.D.) shows that in Jerusalem January 6th was observed as the feast of the Nativity. Whether it was also (in Jerusalem) the feast of the Baptism is doubtful. F. C. Conybeare's researches into Armenian ritual seem to prove the Armenian a combination of the Jerusalem rite celebrating the Nativity and a Greek rite (Alexandrian or Antiochian) celebrating the Baptism."

The meaning of this is that in Jerusalem, as elsewhere, orthodox ritual felt the dangers still attaching to the observance of the ancient (pagan) feast of the Epiphany of Dionysus. The ritual for this feast, almost exactly as described by Epiphanius for the *Koraeon*, or Temple of Κόρη (the Virgin goddess) at Alexandria, is repeated to this day on December 24–25 in the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem.[20] With the Gospels of Matthew

[20] Those who, like the present writer, have attended the all-night observance of Dec. 24–25 in Bethlehem will think themselves almost to be reading an account of this Christian ritual in Epiphanius' description. The feast of Κόρη (Virgin mother of Dionysus) was celebrated on Jan. 6. The preceding night (Jan. 5–6) was spent in singing and worship of the images of the gods. At dawn descent in procession was made to the crypt, bringing up thence a wooden image which had the sign of the cross and a star of gold on hands, knees, and head. After being carried in procession this was returned to the crypt. The Virgin (Κόρη) was declared to have given birth to the *Aeon*. Compare with this the present-day ritual for Dec. 24–25 at Bethlehem.

and Luke Jerusalem observance first makes the primitive celebration of Epiphany, or "Manifestation" of Godhood, a celebration of divine *birth*. Ultimately under Roman influence it adopts a new date. The Fourth Gospel, on the other hand, remains true to the primitive sense of the Markan tradition. It ignores the birth stories, and treats "the beginning of the gospel" as a *Manifestation* of the Godhood, first to the Baptist, at Jordan, afterward to the disciples at Cana. The interval between the two is a six-day period of didactic preparation.

The fourth evangelist is not only "spiritual," but conservative and harmonistic. Gnostic misconstruction is met in two ways. We have first a Prologue presenting a Pauline doctrine of Incarnation, which ends with the explicit declaration (1 14 ff.) that the Logos "became *flesh* and tabernacled among us, and we beheld his glory." As Irenaeus justly observes,[21] "According to the opinion of no one of the heretics was the Logos of God *made flesh*." Secondly, the Baptism itself, so misused in the interest of Docetic and Adoptionist tendencies, is now thrown completely into the background. The reader only learns of it by implication (1 32 f.), while every device of language is employed to make unmistakably clear that its significance is exclusively declaratory (1 19–27, 33). John's baptism is purely and solely that *John* may "see and bear witness that this is the Son of God." Its significance to the (supposably) repentant multitudes who were also baptized is absolutely ignored. To Jesus it has none.

We are not now concerned primarily with this general contrast between Epiphany gospels and Nativity gospels. It is enough merely to point out the difference of the fourth evangelist's method from that of the second and third for meeting the misuse of Mark. We propose to deal merely with the chronological framework in which the fourth evangelist has compacted all that he has to

[21] Haer. III, xi, 3.

tell of Jesus' Self-manifestation to the Disciples, noting that he combines the Synoptic traditions of the Declaration of the Baptist, the Call of the First Disciples and the Declaration of the Messiahship and Confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi into a great complex of Witness to Jesus as "Son of God" (1 34), "Lamb of God" (1 29, 36), "Messiah, which is being interpreted Christ" (41), "him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write" (45), and finally (51) "Son of man." The point to be brought out is that here as at the close of his narrative the evangelist has divided his material into the form of a *hexaëmeros*, culminating "on the third day" after the declaratory discourses (1 19–51) in a symbolic "beginning of his signs in Cana of Galilee," where Jesus "*manifested his glory* and his disciples believed on him."

It is fortunately possible to prove that the early oriental Church understood this "sign" of the turning of the water into wine following upon the Baptism "in Bethany beyond Jordan" (Jn. 1 28) with the Self-revelation to the Disciples, as really belonging to the Feast of Epiphany on January 6th, just as it understood the Anointing in (the other) Bethany, the Triumphal Entry, Footwashing, Crucifixion and Resurrection, as belonging to the feast of "the Passover of the Lord" which constituted its other great Holy Week.

As regards the antiquity of Christian veneration for the feast of the Baptism of Jesus we have testimony beyond all dispute. Clement of Alexandria describes the followers of the arch-gnostic Basilides (*ca.* 125 A.D.) as celebrating it on January 6th (11th Tybi), the date of the Epiphany of Dionysus. Some, however, observed January 10th.[22] As with the pagan festival in the *Koraeon*, the preceding night was spent as a preparatory vigil,

[22] Tybi 15. This was probably to conform to the Basilidean system of thirties and halves of thirty. Jesus was *thirty* years of age. His ministry covered fifteen years of the reign of Augustus and fifteen of that of Tiberius, &c.

"readings" taking the place in the Christian rite of the "singing and worship of the images" in the pagan.[23]

Was there, besides this vigil corresponding to the vigil of the resurrection feast, an observance of preliminary days more or fewer in number? It is difficult to trace back in orthodox observance just what days of preparation may have been prescribed for the great "first feast" of the year. In the Mozarabic or Spanish missal, as well as in the Breviary, there is first mention of a "Sunday before Epiphany"; next a mass *in jejunio Epiphaniae*, i.e., a fast of three days covering January 3–5. This is doubtless primarily intended for catechumens in preparation for baptism, January 6th being the favorite date. That these preliminary days were occupied with the "laying of the foundation of repentance from dead works and faith toward God," follows from all our knowledge of the "teachings of baptisms" and of the primitive system of catechetics. But it is apparent that usage differed. Just as in the case of the preparation for Easter, as described by Irenaeus: "Some think they should fast one day, others two, yet others more." By the time of Epiphanius "a whole week" of observance (not of course unbroken fasting) was the general practice of the Church before Easter. All we can be sure of is that the practice of baptizing at Epiphany made necessary a preliminary period of teaching as well as the days of fasting and night of vigil.

Is it then unreasonable to trace a connection between the "six days" of "teaching" which according to Mark 9 2 and Mt. 17 1 separate the Self-declaration of Jesus as the Christ to the disciples at Caesarea Philippi from the "theophany" of the Transfiguration, and the Johannine six days which intervene between the Witness of the Baptist that this is the Son of God, and the "Manifestation of his glory" to the disciples? The parallelism in

[23] Strom. I, xxi, 146, ἑορτάζουσι προδιανυκτερεύοντες ἐν ἀναγνώσεσι.

content of teaching is not unsupported by traces of ritual interest even in the Synoptists. For the theophany is given at the close of a night of vigil wherein the drowsiness of "Peter, James, and John" is contrasted with the prayerful watching of Jesus, as in the story of Gethsemane (Lk. 9 32), and the Johannine preliminary days have as their content an equivalent for the teaching at Caesarea Philippi.[24]

Unfortunately we have no clear light from primitive practice beyond the data already given to determine whether the "teaching of baptisms" or other services preceding Epiphany covered this exact number of days, or only something like it. Our use of the term *hexaëmeros*, is somewhat general, meaning days of preparation for a sacred occasion like those leading up to the sabbath in Gen. 1 1–2 4, or those leading up to the theophany to Moses in Ex. 24 16, whether an exact correspondence of day for day can be traced or not. If, however, we simply take the notes of time as given in the Johannine account of the Witness to Jesus at his Baptism and Manifestation of his Glory to the Disciples in Jn. 1 19–2 11, we shall have the following succession of days: Day *one:* John's Proclamation of his Mission to Baptize in "Bethany beyond Jordan," 1 19–28. Day *two:* John's Witness to Jesus "on the morrow," 29–34. Day *three:* Sending of the two First Disciples to Jesus, who begin to learn of him "about the tenth hour," 35–42. Day *four:* "on the morrow," full Self-declaration of Jesus to the Disciples, including Confession of Peter and Promise of the Revelation of the Son of man, 43–51. At this point follows a vacant day like the sabbath after the crucifixion—day *five*—and "on

[24] The variant of Lk. 9 28—"about eight days"—would merely indicate the backward instead of the forward look; as the later Church spoke of "the octave" of Epiphany. To Luke the Confession of Peter would be the Epiphany and the Transfiguration its "octave." To Mark and Matthew it would be the beginning of preparation.

the third day" is the Wedding at Cana—day *six*—2 1. The miracle by which Jesus "manifested his glory and his disciples believed on him" (2 11) follows in the evening. It comes therefore at the beginning of the *seventh* day from the Baptism, in which it was given to John to "see and bear witness that this is the Son of God."

For completeness' sake a possible explanation should be added of the single minuter note of time relating to the precise hour when on the third day the first disciples accepted Jesus' invitation and placed themselves under his instruction through the night until the ensuing morning (1 39). If the aetiological method be applied, it will appear more reasonable to compare such ritual notes as Mk. 15 25, 33 f., and Jn. 19 14, than to imagine the evangelist cherishing a sentimental regard for the precise hour of his first contact with Jesus.

In my volume, *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, 1910, I cited the following fact:

> "A very ancient note of time embodied in the 'Western' text of Acts 19 9 informs us that Paul's preaching 'in the school of Tyrannus' at *Ephesus*, was 'daily from the fifth to the tenth hour.'"

If the independent indications of acquaintance on the part of this "Western" interpolator with early conditions in Phrygia justify us in looking upon this as evidence that in Ephesus public preaching customarily ended "at the tenth hour," this would be the natural time to begin the instruction of catechumens.

Further indications are not wanting to lead us to look upon this Johannine story of the Declaration of the Son of God and the Manifestation of his Glory in a Beginning of Miracles somewhat as a series of lessons for Epiphany. But on these we cannot dwell. Limitations of space forbid also that we should here consider the noteworthy connection between the two groups of narratives which Mark has placed the one

at the opening of the Galilean Ministry, the other at the beginning of the Journey to Calvary (Mk. 1 1–39 and 8 27–9 29). In each case we have a declaration of Jesus to be the Son of God, followed by a Manifestation of his Glory, though on the former occasion the Manifestation consists of a Beginning of Miracles at the great Sabbath in Capernaum (Mk. 1 14–39). In each case we have a Voice from Heaven declaring the Sonship, and an Opposition between Sonship "according to the things that be of God," and "the things that be of men." We even have the Rebuke of the Tempter in the same words,[25] although in the Temptation story it is literally Satan who presents the lower ideal, whereas at Caesarea Philippi it is Peter(!). In each case we have, finally, suggestions of the prayers, fastings, and vigils of Jesus, in greater or less contrast with the disciples (cf. Mk. 1 13, 35–39 and parallels, with 9 4–6 and parallels). Jn. 1 19–2 11, considered as lessons for Epiphany, would combine the essential factors of both these Synoptic occasions, as we have seen; while Jn. 2 12 briefly dismisses the Markan account of the Beginning of Miracles. Upon this correspondence we cannot delay, because the really decisive evidence connecting the Johannine *hexaëmeros* with Epiphany is as yet untouched.

The reader in any degree open to the suggestions already made must surely begin to ask: Is there any clear proof connecting this portion of the Fourth Gospel with the ancient celebration of Epiphany on January 6th as the Feast of the Baptism of Christ and Manifestation of his divine Powers (*natalis virtutum*)? And if such connection exists, can it be proved that the observances are not dependent on the Gospel, instead of conversely? The fact is indisputable that in all the

[25] Mark does not indeed give the moral content of the Temptation story, but only states the fact (1 13). The moral content is reserved for 8 27–33; but the occurrence of the Rebuke (8 33) in the very words of Mt. 4 10 cannot be accidental, and the transfer is the significant point.

most ancient rituals Jn. 2 1–11 is the lesson for Epiphany; even the West, when transferring the significance of the feast to the Coming of the Magi, *still retaining the Wedding in Cana* as part of the lesson. But may it not be that the Beginning of Miracles was chosen simply from appropriateness? Why suppose that Jn. 2 1–11 was written to fit the occasion?

The answer is apparent to all who know the real antiquity of the Feast of the Epiphany, and the nature of its pre-Christian observance. For January 6 was not chosen to commemorate the Baptism of Jesus and Manifestation ("Epiphany") of his divine power because of a historical tradition that he was actually baptized on January 6, any more than December 25 was chosen because of a historical tradition that the *dies invicti solis* happened to be Jesus' real birthday. The date, January 6, was chosen because in Egypt and throughout the oriental world it had been from time immemorial the feast of the "Epiphany of Dionysus," the god of returning light and life. The proof that Jn. 2 1–11 is written with an eye to the celebration of this Feast of Epiphany (in Christianized form) and not conversely, is the fact that the "Beginning of Miracles" substituted by the fourth evangelist for the Markan exorcisms and healings in Capernaum is an unmistakable parallel to the wonders told in Egypt, Arabia, Phoenicia, Ionia, and doubtless elsewhere also, of the Epiphany of Dionysus. For as Pliny, Pausanias, and a host of writers both heathen and Christian make clear, the *turning of water to wine* at his festival on January 5–6 was the typical wonder of the god of the vine.[26] In some sanctuaries of the god

[26] Pliny, Nat. Hist. II, 231, relates of the consul Mucianus that he believed the story, Andro in insula templo Liberi patris fontem nonis Januariis semper vini saporem fundere. Cf. Pausanias, VI, xxvi, 1, 2. Athenaeus, I, 61, p. 34a, relates of a place ἀπέχων ὀκτὼ στάδια τῆς Ἠλείας, ἐν ᾧ οἱ ἐγχώριοι κατακλείοντες τοῖς Διονυσίοις χαλκοῦς λέβητας τρεῖς κενοὺς παρόντων τῶν ἐπιδημούντων ἀποσφραγίζονται καὶ ὕστερον ἀνοίγοντες εὑρίσκουσιν οἶνου πεπληρωμένους. See a long list of further authorities cited by Walter Bauer Hdb. z. N. T., Johev., ad loc.

the miracle was performed on water contained in stone or brass receptacles; in other localities the spring or stream itself was turned to wine on the anniversary. Epiphanius knows of the belief as attaching to the wondrous Nile as well as to the marvellous springs of Petra and Gerasa. He had himself tasted the water changed to wine at Cibyra in Caria.[27] The change took place, he expressly says, annually, at Epiphany, *on the anniversary of the miracle at Cana.*

In the case of streams like the Nile and the Adonis (Nahr Ibrahim) where the change of color at time of flood has produced legends traceable to a remote antiquity, the physical origin of the legend is unmistakable. Thus the "green water" of the Nile at Cairo at "low Nile," produced by quantities of algae from the swamps of the Soudan, passes away with the first rise (early in July), the algae being unable to live in turbid water.

"By August the river in lower Egypt is full of dark, red-brown sediment, brought down by the Blue Nile and the Atbara."[28]

That the pagan legend of the blood of the slaughtered Osiris cast into the Nile has its origin in this phenomenon of the rapid change in color at the beginning of flood from "green" to "dark red-brown," will not be doubted even by those who hesitate to attribute a similar origin to the biblical story of Moses' turning its waters to blood. The same is of course true of the legend of the slaughtered Adonis and the Adonis river, which annually at the beginning of flood (January) discolors the whole Mediterranean off the shore at Byblus (Jebeel) with its blood-red sediment. But we are concerned simply with the antiquity and extent of the Dionysiac legends of the

[27] Panar. li.

[28] F. R. Cana in Enc. Brit. ed. xi, *s.v.* "Nile."

turning of water to wine on January 6th.[29] Additional evidence of so well attested a fact is hardly required; but it is well to note that the modern custom (in Russia and elsewhere) of blessing streams and rivers at Epiphany (January 6) goes back not only to Christian but into pre-Christian antiquity.[30] It was the day in which Christ by his baptism had "consecrated the streams of Jordan," as Ignatius himself (115 A.D.) writes to the Ephesians (xviii) of the passion of Jesus as "cleansing water" (cf. Jn. 2 4). Hence one of the functions of the day was the solemn consecration of water for baptisms throughout the year. Just as the modern pilgrim still obtains his bottle of water for baptisms from Jordan at the place of the Baptizing, so in pagan times, as we learn from Aristides Rhetor (135 A.D.), it was part of the ὑδρεύσις (i.e. Water-festival) in Alexandria on Tybi 11 (January 6) to draw water and store it up for purposes of lustration. This water was exported like the modern Jordan water, and was supposed to improve with age like wine.[31]

Finally, Epiphany as the "first feast" came to have the same calendar importance for the Church as the *Rosh-hashanah* for the Synagogue. For on it the "Paschal letters" were sent out to determine the fasts and feasts of the ecclesiastical year.

It may, of course, be mere coincidence that the *hexaëmeros* with which the Fourth Gospel begins, has its

[29] Egyptian datings are of course different. Variants arise from causes both physical and religious. The flood of Nile begins in July, not January. On the other hand, the calendar is largely determined by astral phenomena, so that sun-myths and nature-myths intermingle. Finally, the Egyptian calendar rotates through the year, the Egyptian year being defective.

[30] The same Maximus Taurinensis who speaks of Epiphany as the dies natalis virtutum (sc. Domini), gives three alternative traditions of the origin of its observance: Ferunt enim hodie Christum Dominum nostrum vel (1) stella duce a gentibus adoratum, vel (2) invitatum ad nuptias aquas in vino vertisse, vel (3) succepto a Iohanne baptismate consecrasse fluenta Jordanis (Hom. xxix).

[31] Oratio, Oxford ed. of 1730, ii, 573 and 612. Cited by Lake in Dictionary of Religion and Ethics, *s.v.* "Epiphany."

start on New Year's Day of the Julian calendar (January 1). The "Witness of John" to the Jews (1 19–28), like his baptism of Jesus, falls appropriately within the limits of the old year; for John, though greatest of the prophets, is less than the least in the kingdom of God. But "on the morrow" he proclaims Jesus as "Lamb of God," Giver of "the Spirit," and "Son of God" (29–34). This (*if* the evangelist has the beginning of the year in mind) would be January 1. For the Confession of Peter "on the morrow" (35–42) falls thus on January 2, the Promise of the Revelation of the Son of man given "on the morrow" (43–51) falls on January 3, the Arrival in Cana "on the third day" falls on January 5, and the Changing of the Water of "the Jews' Purifications" to the New Wine of the Kingdom of God takes place in the evening of January 5–6, i.e. on "Twelfth Night," or Epiphany.

However the case may be with this possibility of an attempted adjustment in Jn. 1 19–2 11 to the Julian calendar, as in Cappadocia was the practice for the observance of Easter,[32] it is highly probable that the synchronism with the rebuilding of the temple, in the story of the beginning of the public ministry, which in Jn. 2 13–22 follows immediately after the Manifestation "to the Disciples," has been purposely adapted to mark the birth of Jesus as synchronous with the rebuilding of the temple and consequently his death as occurring when he had lived exactly a jubilee of years ($7 \times 7 = 49$). For, as we have shown in the work already cited,[33] the "year of the two Gemini" (29 A.D.) was an accepted date for the Crucifixion from the very earliest period to which our sources reach back. And yet this date is *certainly*

[32] The Cappadocian Quartodecimans adopted March 25, i.e. vernal equinox of the Julian calendar, in every year as their fixed date for the Feast of the Resurrection. See Bacon, Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate, 1910, p. 391 ff.

[33] Fourth Gospel, &c., p. 390 ff.

incorrect; for *no* method of calculating the incidence of passover permits it to fall on either a Thursday or a Friday in 29 A.D. The date 29 A.D. for the Crucifixion is *artificial*, like the elaborate datings of the Jewish rabbis, and like those of Hippolytus and the later Christian chronographers. But it is the chronological starting-point for both Luke and John. Only the fourth evangelist looks upon Jesus as older "when he began." The synchronism of Jn. 2 20, substituted for Lk. 3 1 f. at approximately the same point in the story, means (as it was understood to mean by the author of *de montibus Sina et Sion*) that Jesus attained, either at this passover or the next, the age of 47 years. At the passover of Jn. 6 4 he had therefore attained 48 years, at the ensuing feast of tabernacles of Jn. 7 2 he was "not yet fifty years old" (8 57); but at the passover of the crucifixion he had attained 49 (i.e. 7×7) years, so that the beginning of his fiftieth or "jubilee" year marked "the hour when he should be glorified."

This interpretation of the calendar and chronology of the fourth evangelist implies of course that he does not accept the statement of Lk. 3 23 that "Jesus when he began (his ministry) was about thirty years of age." But what is the real source and value of this Lukan date? In my article "*Lukan* vs. *Johannine Chronology*"[34] and the further discussion of the subject in the volume already referred to,[35] I endeavored to show that the item Lk. 3 23 stands absolutely alone, though its clear and positive statement has carried everything before it in later attempts to fix the date of Jesus' birth. Matthew's narrative certainly implies that he was much older. Luke's own sources imply that he was born "in the days of Herod the king" (Lk. 1 5), if not that he had "fully attained the age of forty years" when he began

[34] Expositor, vii, 15 (March, 1907), pp. 206–220.

[35] Fourth Gospel, &c., ch. xv.

his ministry (Ac. 7 23). Moreover the ancient tradition of "the elders" derived by Irenaeus [36] from Papias, that Jesus had fully attained the age of the teacher (forty years), when he began to teach, is by no means to be lightly disregarded. But while able to show that the thirty-year item was in conflict with earlier tradition, and suspecting that it stood connected with the system of reckoning by fifteens and thirties characteristic of the Basilidean chronography, I was not then able to point to any specific passage to which it might be traced. I may venture now to refer to the statement of Jerome in his commentary on Ezekiel concerning the current interpretation of Ezek. 1 1. He tells us that the date, "In the thirtieth year," was usually understood of the prophet's age,[37] but while denying this goes on to explain that "the fourth month in the fifth day of the month" means January fifth "the day still observed as Epiphany," and that "symbolically" Ezekiel in saying "In the thirtieth year, in the fourth month, the fifth day of the month, the heavens were opened and I saw visions of God" is "prefiguring the Lord and Saviour, who came to his baptism at thirty years of age, which for man is the age of maturity." Thereafter in spite of his rejection of the current interpretation Jerome adds:

> "It must also be understood that the Lord came to baptism in the thirtieth year of his age, in the fourth month, that which among us is called January and stands first at the opening of the year. . . . And he [Ezekiel] adds 'the fifth day of the month' to signify the baptism, at which 'the heavens were opened' to Christ, and this is still the adorable day of Epiphany."[38]

I cannot but think that in this ancient dating of Epiphany on the basis of Ezek. 1 1, as occurring on

[36] Haer. II, xxii, 5. The whole chapter is significant.

[37] Non, ut plerique aestimant, tricesimus annus aetatis prophetae dicitur.

[38] Comm. in Ezek. ad loc.

January 5, in the thirtieth year of Jesus' age, we have the real origin of the unique statement of Lk. 3 23, that when "the heavens were opened" to Jesus, and he "saw visions of God" and began his ministry, "he was about thirty years of age." The fourth evangelist has the same dating for Epiphany, but holds that Jesus had nearly attained the age of *fifty* years. Irenaeus, as we know, attempts to reconcile the two by extending the ministry over a period of twenty (!) years.[39]

[39] Haer. II, xxii.

BOOK REVIEWS

BOOKS ON THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE APOCRYPHA.

A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament. George Buchanan Gray, D.D. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1913. Pp. 253. 75 cents.

The Literature of the Old Testament. George Foot Moore. Home University Library of Modern Knowledge, No. 65. Henry Holt & Co. 1913. Pp. 256. 50 cents.

The Book of Job. Homer B. Sprague, Ph.D. Sherman, French, & Co. 1913. Pp. 243. $1.25.

Le Livre du Prophète Amos. Extrait de la Bible du Centenaire, préparée par la Société Biblique de Paris. Société Biblique de Paris. 1913.

As Professor Gray says in his introductory chapter, little even of the canonical literature of the ancient Hebrews was written with any immediate intention that it should form part of a sacred book. This being so, an inquiry into the origin and history of this literature has to consider two questions which are more or less distinct. The one question is, how and when did the Jewish community accept this literature as sacred and authoritative; the other question is, how and when were the contents of this literature written.

Professor Gray in his volume concerns himself immediately with the second of these questions, prefacing his work with the briefest statement only of conclusions which many have reached and in which he concurs, viz.: Parts of the "Law" were accepted as an authoritative book as early as Josiah's Reformation in 621 B.C.; the whole, or substantially the whole, Law was so accepted by 444 B.C.; the "Prophets" became part of the Jewish Scripture not improbably soon after 250 B.C.; and the "Writings" gradually obtained the same position within the next two or three centuries. Then follow two hundred or more pages devoted to a popular but satisfactory statement of how and when the contents of the various Old Testament books got into their present form.

Professor Moore, on the other hand, devotes the first chapter of his valuable little volume to a discussion of the first of the above questions: How and when the Jewish community accepted the Old Testament canonical books as sacred and authoritative. This discussion on the formation of the Canon is marked by that in-

cisiveness of attack and clearness of statement which renders all the writer's work so valuable. The book as a whole is excellent, and is unquestionably the best popular treatment of the subject to put into the hands of interested laymen and laywomen.

The Book of Job is admittedly the finest literary creation of Semitic genius; as such it should not be reserved for the enjoyment of the few who may master Hebrew, but should be made accessible to all for their joy and inspiration. Dr. Sprague has studied the problem for twenty years, and the results lie before us in iambic metre. The Prologue and Epilogue he has left in prose.

An introductory essay advances the theory that the Book of Job is an allegory of man's past, present, and future, and that the main object of the discussion between Job and his three friends was the refutation of the prevalent hard-and-fast doctrine of the Old Testament, that worldly prosperity measures merit. It proposes a more hopeful solution of the mystery of undeserved suffering in the light of the doctrine of Evolution. It accounts for Job's inconsistencies by the theory that at times his unparalleled sufferings affected his reason, paroxysms of wildest frenzy alternating with lucid intervals of sweetness and light.

The Book of Amos possesses an interest all its own as being the oldest Hebrew book that has been preserved to us. Yet it gains a stronger claim than this upon our attention when once we have carefully read it; for the book has something inexplicable about it in that, oldest though it is, it presents many of the greatest thoughts of literary prophecy at an already high state of development. Any new translation of the Book of Amos, especially one that shows the scholar's hand, is therefore welcomed with interest. The French translation put forth by the Bible Society of Paris is to be commended as a compendium of scholarly results. By means of the clever use of type of different sizes, and brackets, parentheses, asterisks, etc., the original text, as modified by different hands, is clearly indicated. The notes at the foot of each page, though short, are illuminating. Perhaps some day English and American Bible Societies will give us such texts.

Max Kellner.

Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge.

Die Apostelgeschichte. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Begründet von H. A. W. Meyer. Neunte Auflage bearbeitet von H. H. Wendt. Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht. Göttingen. 1913. Pp. iv, 370. 8*m*.

The eighth edition of Wendt's commentary on Acts in the Meyer series was published in 1899. Since then, a mass of relevant literature has accumulated, including the valuable discussions of von Harnack. Loyal to his duty as an editor of a Meyer commentary, Wendt has read, marked, and inwardly digested that literature, or at least the best of it, with the result that he has been able to offer to the student of early church history an edition of Acts at once brought down to date and indispensable.

The external form of this, the ninth, edition has changed, but the main positions of the eighth edition as regards the text, purpose, authorship, date, and sources of Acts are again defended. In respect, however, of the chronology and the historical trustworthiness of the document, some adjustment of opinion is manifest. To illustrate: the readings of the Western text are still regarded, with a few exceptions (e.g., the "we" in 11 28), as secondary; the purpose of Acts is primarily historical and secondly unto edification, no apologetic tendencies in reference to the Roman government being discernible; the name of the author is unknown; and the date, since Acts betrays acquaintance with the *Antiquities* of Josephus, is to be set between 95 and 100 A.D. Nor has Wendt shifted his ground noticeably in the matter of sources. As in the eighth edition, so now, he maintains that the author had access to but one written source. Not that the document must have been actually in the hands of the author of Acts; he may have used it only as he remembered it from a previous reading or hearing (p. 24). This one written source, which is not simply a diary or a travel-document but a history of early Christian missions with a decided interest in Paul, furnishes the basis of the narrative of Acts about Stephen, the founding of the church at Antioch, the three missionary tours which started from that Syrian city, and the voyage to Rome. Since the document ended with the two years at Rome, and since the author of Acts had no trustworthy traditions about the outcome of the imprisonment, the book of Acts ends where the source ended. Wendt still believes that there are traces of the source in 2 43–47, 4 32–35, and 5 12–15, but he is no longer confident that these traces mark the beginning of the document. The author of the source is not improbably Luke, who was an eye-witness of some of the events narrated. The unknown author of Acts, when he comes to write his book, has at his

disposal, besides the information from that source, only a bundle of traditions of unequal worth.

But while Wendt's conclusions regarding the sources of Acts remain essentially unaltered, the reasons for them have been re-written and amplified (cf. especially pp. 21–37). The decisive criterion, we are now informed, for the detection of a written source in Acts is neither the literary character (language, style, etc.) of the work nor its historical trustworthiness, but the appearance in the text of numerous and important cases of unevenness, inconsistency, contradiction, evident misinterpretation, and the like, instances which are to be found not only in the first half but also in the second half of the book. In this connection it is interesting to note that Wendt disputes the contention of von Harnack that in 28 8–10, there is an indication that the "we" functioned as a physician; in fact, our editor dismisses the "medical language of St. Luke" with the dry remark that it were as easy to prove from the nautical expressions that the author of them was a sailor by profession as to prove from the medical expressions that he was a physician.

Turning now to the points in which Wendt has modified or changed his views, we observe that a study of the Delphi inscription has led him to put the arrival of Gallio in Corinth in the summer of 52 (Deissmann says 51). This fixed date compels him then to push back the Apostolic Conference from 52 (in his eighth edition) to 49. On the other hand, he still holds that Festus came into office in 61, so that the dates of the last five years of Paul's life remain as hitherto, 59–64. As regards the historical value of Acts, Wendt, apart from the preface of his new edition, entertains much the same opinions as those set forth in the edition of 1899. Two quotations will suffice. "The peculiar mingling of matter of unequal historical worth is a fact to which justice could not be done either by deriving the whole book, as tradition derives it, from the writer of the 'we' sections or by holding, as radical criticism holds, that the whole book is a writing influenced by ecclesiastical politics. The proper explanation of the phenomena of Acts is found only when one recognizes that the book contains an older narrative written by one who for a time was a companion of Paul, a narrative which a sub-apostolic writer has worked over, combining this valuable source with various sorts of traditional material" (p. 37). "Many of the long speeches of the book are free compositions of the author; not only the speeches of Peter but also some of the speeches of Paul (13 16 ff., 14 15 ff., 22 1 ff., 24 10 ff.)." In the preface, however, Wendt confesses himself a convert to Norden's opinion that the address at Athens

is wholly a composition of the author of Acts, who knew either the lost treatise of Apollonius—*On Sacrifices*—or else a biography of Apollonius in which the references to that treatise were more precise than in the extant *Life of Apollonius* by Philostratus. From one or other of these sources the author of Acts borrowed the theme of Paul's speech at Athens. Notwithstanding his acceptance of Norden's hypothesis, Wendt assures us that his general estimate of Acts is not affected, nor his particular view of the relation of Acts as a whole to its main source.

The quotations and references seem to have been carefully verified; the slight inaccuracy however in the quotation (17 23) from Philostratus holds over from the eighth edition. Furthermore, the English reader who still finds Alexander and Lumby in the list of the commentaries has a right to wonder why there is no mention of one or more of the following commentators: Knowling (1900), Rackham (1901), Bartlet (1901), Gilbert (1908), Furneaux (1912).

J. E. Frame.

Union Theological Seminary, New York.

Die Bergrede. Hare Herkomst en Strekking. K. F. Proost. J. Brandt & Zoon. Amsterdam. 1914. Pp. 163.

This is a Leyden dissertation for the doctorate in theology. It discusses the sources and original form of the Sermon on the Mount, the eschatology of the Synoptic Gospels and the eschatological character of the ethics of the Gospels, and the relation of the ethics of the Gospels to Jewish ethics; ending with a commentary on the Sermon on the Mount which is in the main a collection of Jewish parallels to the sayings of Jesus in the Sermon.

The author has an extensive knowledge of modern literature on the Synoptic problem, and especially on the Sermon on the Mount and of the eschatological controversy, and discusses the questions with sufficient independence. After an exposition and criticism of the theories of Wellhausen and Harnack, he comes to the conclusion that the supposed source "Q" is nothing more than a name for what Matthew and Luke have in common beyond Mark. In the other controversy he enrolls himself with the "eschatologists," and decides that the moral teachings of the Sermon on the Mount are an "interim ethics," binding until the coming of the Kingdom, and contain the conditions of entrance into the Kingdom.

In the comparison of the Sermon on the Mount with Jewish ethics, he deals more fairly with the Jewish side than many who have written on the subject; but his Jewish parallels are chiefly the shop-

worn quotations, gathered from authors whose bias he himself remarks. Bacher's works on the "Agada" do not seem to have been used at all.

Like many dissertators, Dr. Proost compels the reader to accompany him through his investigation, conducting us into blind alleys to point triumphantly at the very bottom to the sign "No Thoroughfare." In a great part of the volume we recognize that we are only reading revised note-books, excerpts and analyses, criticisms and observations, which have never been digested or assimilated.

For a *specimen eruditionis* there is an extraordinary number of misprints in the Greek; and some suspicion falls on the rabbinical erudition of a scholar who does not know what the Hebrew equivalents for "this world," "the world to come," are.

G. F. Moore.

Harvard University.

The Epistle of Priesthood: Studies in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Alexander Nairne. T. & T. Clark. 1913. Pp. 446.

The Professor of Hebrew in King's College, London, is the latest of many distinguished Old Testament scholars who have been attracted to the study of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Professor Nairne, however, while he makes excellent use of his special knowledge of the Old Testament background, is more concerned with the permanent religious message of the Epistle than with its treatment of Jewish ritual. The book is divided into two independent sections: (1) a discussion of the teaching of the Epistle, taken as a whole; (2) a detailed exposition, following the order of the chapters. This arrangement has several advantages; but the argument of Hebrews might have been set forth in truer perspective if the general discussion had gone hand in hand with regular exposition.

As regards the critical question, Professor Nairne holds that the Epistle was written at the beginning of the Roman war by a Hellenistic Jew, and is addressed not so much to a given church as to a little company of friends who were tempted to desert their new faith and make common cause with their nation. Confronted with a terrible crisis, they felt that the belief in Jesus as the Messiah was a minor issue; and their friend seeks to keep them within the church by pointing them to the larger and deeper implications of this belief. This he does by considering the life and death of Jesus in their "sacramental" significance. Those aspects of the Gospel history which the common mind was disposed to regard superficially are

brought into the light of the eternal. The earthly life of Jesus is interpreted by the idea of Incarnation; his death on the Cross, by that of an all-sufficing Priesthood. For Professor Nairne the whole secret of the Epistle to the Hebrews is to be sought in its varied applications of the "sacramental principle." Its author was less a theologian or philosopher than one of those minds to which all visible things become the symbols of unseen realities. "He finds a deep spiritual idea of priesthood, of bringing Godward, to be at the heart of all natural life from the beginning of the world, and he marshals his Lord's earthly life on those ascending lines which run up into the will of God. Here is indeed the sacrament of sacraments. In it the visible and the eternal are really one."[1] In the general discussion and the exposition alike Professor Nairne elaborates this conception, and tries to show how it governs the whole thought of the Epistle. The book is a strikingly fresh and original one, informed with a fine religious spirit, and illuminated here and there by real flashes of insight. It is written in a style that is always graceful and interesting, and is relieved, perhaps too frequently, by illustrations from a wide range of literature. From a theological point of view it is suggestive, but to our mind not a little provoking. Professor Nairne makes no real attempt to place the theology of Hebrews in its historical relation to Paulinism, Alexandrianism, Jewish speculation, primitive eschatology. He evades the difficult problems involved in the cardinal doctrine of the priestly intercession in the heavenly sanctuary. He has little to say about the conception of faith which is distinctive of this Epistle. In his account of the "sacramentalism" of Hebrews there is much that has never been better said; but we venture the observation that he clings too fondly to this term, and allows it to warp and obscure his thinking. It is hardly possible to dissociate the term from a certain ecclesiastical type of Christianity; and to describe the writer to the Hebrews as a "sacramentalist" is to identify him with modes of thought which belong to a much later time. Whether consciously or not, Professor Nairne has been at little pains to avoid this confusion. By the use of a misleading term he too often disguises the true character of the symbolism of Hebrews.

E. F. Scott.

Queen's University, Kingston, Canada.

[1] P. 67.

THE WORKINGMAN'S CHRIST. CRAIG S. THOMS. Dodd, Mead, & Co. 1914. Pp. 292. $1.25.

This book is symptomatic of the fact that the churches are waking up. A particular class of man, the workingman, has of late become the object of their special solicitude, and this first because the workingmen constitute the bulk of the population, and secondly, this preponderating section of the community is in a large measure not interested in the churches. The churches prevailingly have dealt with other-worldly, *post mortem*, interests; whereas for the workingman, the wage-earner, the man dependent for subsistence on his securing employment, the struggle for life is so intense that he has neither interest nor energy left for matters not of immediate concern.

The book is popular in its treatment and attractive in its arrangement. Its fourteen chapters are divided into three parts—"The Church and the Workingman," "Christ and the Workingman," "Christ's Programme." Each chapter is broken up into paragraphs provided with a caption, so that the book is inviting to read. The object of the book is to mediate between the churches and the unchurched. The author's sympathies are with both sides. While he has read the popular literature of the day on his subject, he is not wholly emancipated from traditionalism. However, he is headed right. Were he more thoroughgoing, he probably would not be so serviceable as a mediator. Like Milton's lion at the creation, he is half in and half out, "striving to set free his hinder parts from the earth's crust."

His broad churchmanship is shown when he says of the church on page 59, "Her forms and methods are not final, but must ever be changed to meet changing needs." He still hopes for the solution of the antinomy between capital and labor as the result of the Christianizing of the capitalist and the laborer; not understanding that the very fact of each being capitalist and laborer makes impossible the true Christianizing of either party. What he says on page 214—"The Captains of Industry must be socialized by being Christianized"—would be truer if it read, The Captains of Industry will be Christianized only as the result of their being socialized.

He is at his best when he says on page 95, "The workingman's battle is the battle of this century, his question the question of human rights, his problem the problem of democracy, and his claim to economic and social justice an expression of the mind of the Master"; and, page 123, "The ethics of Jesus can find their fullest expression only in a democracy." It is wearisome, however, in a

book professing to have the social point of view to find the time-worn dogma (p. 214), "To have a new society there must first be new men—men with a new heart." Is it not high time that the realization should begin to gain headway that the true and practicable way, and withal the Biblical way, of getting new men, is to take the old men and put them into new and favorable surroundings? No amount of exhortation to men to be good and brotherly and Christian has ever availed nor can avail on any large scale, when the very necessities of their circumstances and of their environment make it well nigh impossible, or at least extremely difficult, to be anything else but predatory and anti-social.

One of the best parts of the book is the concluding chapter—"Man as Creator"—because of its social implications, involving the co-operation of God and man to establish the Kingdom of God. "Man's greatest need is a cause big enough to spend his life for" (p. 288); "There is only one such cause—'Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness'" (p. 291). When the church finally awakes to a realization of what the Gospel really is, to wit, the proclamation of the Cause of Jesus Christ, the invitation to all men to co-operate with God in that Cause, leaving their individual salvation and future welfare to come as a by-product, there will follow a revival such as the world has never known.

The book can only do good and should be widely read within the church and without.

Charles P. Fagnani.

Union Theological Seminary.

Theological Symbolics. Charles Augustus Briggs. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1914. Pp. 429. $2.50.

The times of dogmatic authority in the Protestant world have long passed, if they ever existed outside narrow limits. Indeed the study of dogma is not for the purpose of imposing old fixed forms upon new generations, but rather for opening up a broad view of the origins of church teaching. Students like Adolf Harnack have even had the general aim of undermining dogmatic authority; believing that the arising of theology, apart from its general acceptance as dogma, was responsible not only for the development but for the transformation of the first facts of belief and experience. But a positive purpose of this character has not been in the mind of most earnest students. There is no doubt that the fundamental study of the origin of theology, while weakening the sense of dogmatic au-

thority, does very significantly deepen the conviction of the genuineness of historical faith, and strengthen the respect for and interest in the religious convictions out of which the natural variations of theology have arisen. In other words, the historical study of religious beliefs instead of narrowing and hardening the views of the earnest student, is one of the most broadening and helpful of modern studies. The man who knows will have wide interests and cannot be a bigot.

After a long period of non-production in our English world, two important books on Creeds have recently appeared. At the end of 1911 W. A. Curtis, the young Professor of Theology in the University of Aberdeen, brought out his history in a book of 502 pages.[2] And Dr. Charles Augustus Briggs's book of 429 pages—*Theological Symbolics*[3]—was published early in 1914 by his daughter, ably assisted by President Francis Brown of Union Seminary, who also wrote an appreciative preface. The importance of a scholarly book on such a subject cannot be overestimated.

Both these books are by able scholars. Dr. Briggs spent his life in the study of the Bible and its doctrines, producing a long list of theological and historical works, and contributing many learned articles to encyclopaedias and theological journals. His hair whitened at his tasks. It is a pleasure to follow the lead of a thorough scholar, who makes one feel that no scrap of printed information has escaped him, and who can speak with confidence because he has himself actually been over many parts of the universal field. It was not mere self-appreciation which led Dr. Briggs once to say to a well-known Edinburgh publisher with whom he was negotiating for the publication of his *Psalms*, that he probably knew more about the subject than any other living scholar. This was no less true in many other fields. It was quite natural, therefore, in the present volume, that of some 115 foot-note references to modern theological and historical literature, 58 were to his own publications, covering almost the whole range of theological discussion.

Dr. Briggs's book, though bearing the title, *Theological Symbolics*, is confined quite strictly to the regular orthodox lines. It gives no heretical or non-Christian beliefs, ancient or modern, nor even of post-Reformation sects or denominational divisions. Dr. Briggs also definitely excludes from Symbolics any consideration of Christian Institutions; and he thinks that by such consideration Katten-

[2] A History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith in Christendom and Beyond, with Historical Tables. T. & T. Clark. 1911.

[3] Charles Scribner's Sons. 1914.

busch and Loofs have overloaded their Symbolics, which might have been easily treated separately, as is done, for example, by Stanley and A. V. G. Allen. The main divisions of Dr. Briggs's book show the direction and limitations of his interests.

The first 120 pages are given to "Fundamental Symbolics," including an analytical study of the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Athanasian Creed, and the Faith of Chalcedon. Part Second, consisting of 130 pages, is given to "Particular Symbolics," in which he refers, in a brief and sketchy fashion, to the various Symbols of the Latin Church, the origin of the Reformation and its Symbols, the Symbols of the seventeenth century, Roman Catholic Symbols of the nineteenth century, and the Protestantism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Part Third, of 162 pages, is devoted to "Comparative Symbolics," in which he takes up the consideration of the principles of the Reformation, the Sacraments, Doctrines of Faith and Morals, the Formula of Concord and its Opponents, the Synod of Dort and Arminianism, Old and New Calvinism, the Westminster Confession, the conflicts of British Christianity, and at the end only a bare half-dozen pages to the "Modern Consensus" (pp. 406–413). His study practically concludes with the Westminster Confession; so that the limits of his doctrinal study are found in the early Creeds recognized alike by Catholics and Reformers, and the main Catholic and Protestant forms, as they stood after the Reformation in Germany and Great Britain. This is a field certainly large enough for the limits of his book, though leaving out of consideration many interesting and important developments.

If we examine three of the simple requirements which a scholarly book of this kind must meet, they will furnish us a sufficient basis for judgment. It should be comprehensive—omitting nothing fundamental; absolutely historical—giving the necessary historical setting, and including the historical bibliography; analytical and comparative—the exegesis not only fundamental but above all things without personal bias. This is the one great field in which superficiality or partisanship can have no message of value.

Dr. Briggs, as already indicated, chose his task in the beaten path of historical orthodoxy, though his broad title certainly should not legitimately have left out of view the very virile theological work which does not receive or aspire to that category. It is a grave question whether one can ever really comprehend the heart of orthodox truth without also seeing to the full the thought which struggled against it, and not infrequently changed the character of its devel-

opment. Dr. Briggs has given careful attention to the historical setting, which is the best of all ways to arrive at an understanding of the real meaning and significance of Christianity. In his very full and admirable historical introductions he may have intended to give all the attention he considered necessary to variant thought, but it is more than probable that his temper of mind did not interest him in that direction. He found his scholarly instincts leading him deep into the old history.

In its bibliography Dr. Briggs's book is pre-eminent. No German volume of its kind surpasses it. No other book in English approaches it. No important scrap of bibliographical information in the field which it covers is found wanting. It is from this side that one is able to realize the thoroughness with which Dr. Briggs devoted his life to fundamental scholarly investigation. Dr. Briggs also goes deep into the doctrinal analysis of the creeds. This, of course, is the most difficult task confronting the theologian, to know how to subordinate the subordinate, and to make the great great. Professor Fisher, and especially Dr. Philip Schaff, had already done very broad work in this general interpretative field; and it is not mild praise to say that Dr. Briggs's work compares favorably here with theirs. But here is still the awaiting field, if one may confess it, for the still greater theologian yet to come. It is on its successful doing that the future good understanding between the different branches of Christendom is to depend. The intellectual temper of Dr. Briggs manifests itself quite clearly. In his deep respect for the ancient principles and forms of the teaching he often reminds one of the Bishop of Oxford.[4] This attitude he never surrenders. It gives him reverence for many forms of thought which Liberal theology may have entirely dismissed. It is interesting to follow his earnest exposition and defence of the Virgin Birth of Christ, and Purgatory.

But when we come to the important question of ability to do justice to variant phases, and especially modern thought, Dr. Briggs shows his limitations. Here lies the weakness of such a distinctive personality as his. His few references to modern views indicate his inability to contribute anything of value in that direction. For example, he classes Kantian and Ritschlian thought together, as "reducing Christianity to a moral system" (p. 246), which, of course, is not really true even of Kant, and certainly not of Ritschl, who saw ethics springing out of religion. But this generalization is not so bad as another in which he classes Ritschl, along with Renan and

[4] The Basis of Anglican Fellowship in Faith and Organization, by Charles Gore, D.D., Bishop of Oxford. A. R. Mowbray & Co. Easter, 1914.

Baur, as putting forth "a series of efforts to get rid of the historic Christ and Apostolic Christianity." And he confidently assures us that "all these have been refuted by the great theologians of the last century. All have been driven from the field except the school of Ritschl, about which the opponents of the supernatural have rallied for a desperate stand against Apostolic Christianity" (p. 246). This is too trifling a treatment of such theologians as Herrmann, Kaftan, Kattenbusch, and such historians as Harnack and Loofs. All these men make the historic Christ the central point of their religious world. Only radical leaders like Troeltsch, after abandoning the position of Ritschl, attacked the uniqueness of Christ and the positiveness of Christianity. Yet it is Troeltsch who enjoys the distinction of using fresh arguments in strengthening the theistic position.

Dr. Briggs's book was earnestly written in the interests of Christian unity. Indeed, in his later years he was inspired by this enthusiasm, and even cherished hopes of nearer Catholic and Protestant reapproachment, with possible church union—which is a different matter. At least he has made his best contribution in this field.

In many important directions these books of Professor Curtis and Dr. Briggs supplement each other, and together make a notable scholarly contribution to the resources of the student of historical Christianity.

Albert Temple Swing.

Oberlin, Ohio.

The Influence of the Bible on Civilization. Ernst von Dobschütz, Professor of the New Testament in the University of Halle-Wittenberg. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. 190. $1.25.

In this popular sketch Professor Dobschütz has made available the results of his studies upon the attitude of the Christian Church toward the Bible at different periods, and of the influence of the Bible upon civilization at these epochs. The first chapter is a particularly clear and illuminating discussion of the process by which the church came to recognize the harmony of the Old and New Testaments and the authority of the entire book. What early scholars failed to see is that unity does not imply uniformity, and because they failed to see it the whole Bible was placed upon one level of authority, and the tendency to interpret the New Testament in the light of the Old was carried to an unwarrantable extreme. Modern historical criticism has made inevitable the distinctions that

would have saved the church from a pernicious attitude toward the Bible. Professor Dobschütz goes so far as to say: "The spiritualizing and allegorizing of real history"—the direct outcome of the attitude toward the Bible to which we have just referred—"is the greatest damage ever done to religion" (p. 20).

The chapters unfolding the influence of the Bible upon political, social, moral, and literary ideals abundantly repay study. In a brief compass the author has condensed and put into concrete form the story of an evolution with which every well-informed man should be familiar. The reasons which led the church to withhold the Scriptures from the laity are clearly set forth, and he brings this attitude of the Popes into closer connection than is usual with the increasing influence of the Albigensians. Professor Dobschütz' analysis of the Albigensian theology will be novel to those writers who have confused them with the Waldensians.

The influence of the art of printing, of historical criticism, and of new scientific theories upon the modern attitude toward the Scriptures has been, on the whole, in the opinion of Professor Dobschütz, to withdraw the Bible from general civilization and to restrict it to its own proper domain, religion (p. 181). Even in theology, he holds the Bible is the source of historical information, not the authoritative proof of doctrine. Prof. Dobschütz treats fairly the popular contention that if the Bible is not true from cover to cover, then it seems not to be trustworthy at all. The answer he makes is that this contention "confuses two different aspects which ought to be kept separate. The Bible is not a text-book . . . it is a book of Christian devotion. This was its original intention, and I venture to think that it is not a loss but a gain if the Bible is once more applied to its proper purpose" (p. 186). The true function of the Bible in regard to the church, he holds, is not to give it a rule for dogma, but to provide it with an historical orientation that will give it the right direction for the setting forth of doctrine (p. 188). The closing chapter, from which these positions are taken, will awaken the most dissent among conservative scholars. The difference between them and the author will touch his denials rather than his affirmations.

George E. Horr

The Newton Theological Institution.

THE THREE RELIGIONS OF CHINA. W. E. SOOTHILL. Hodder & Stoughton. 1913. Pp. xii, 324.

This volume contains lectures given in Oxford in 1912 under the auspices of the Board for the Training of Missionaries, the establishment of which was one of the fruits of the Edinburgh Missionary Conference in 1910. The author, who spent thirty years in China, was formerly Principal of the Shansi Imperial University and is to be the President of the United Universities Central-China University.

Chapters are devoted to Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism, severally, dealing chiefly with the origin and the distinctive types of the three religions. These religions are not, however, like so many streams flowing each in its own proper channel, but have overflowed and mingled their waters, so that the common notions of the Chinese on religious subjects and their religious life are a fusion or confusion of ideas and practices derived from all these sources. The following chapters, accordingly, show how early and classical Chinese conceptions have developed, and how they have been modified by Taoism and Buddhism, under the heads: "The Idea of God"; "Man's Relationship to God and Approach to the Divine"; "Cosmological Ideas"; "The Soul, Ancestor Worship, Eschatology"; "Moral Ideals"; "Sin and its Consequences"; "The Official Cult, or Public Religion"; "Private Religion."

The treatment is well suited to the purpose of the lectures; the main features are clearly set out and illustrated, without being obscured by a multiplicity of details. The author does not follow Legge and Ross in their reconstruction of primitive monotheism, nor does he imitate De Groot in carrying back the dualism of Yin and Yang to the beginnings of Chinese religion or in finding the key to everything in the idea of "Tao." An admirable sanity pervades the whole discussion, and full justice is done to the higher elements in Chinese religion and morals, without disguising its animistic and polytheistic features.

Like several recent writers, Mr. Soothill is inclined to ascribe some of the characteristic developments of Mahayana Buddhism to Christian influence. He thinks that the notions of heaven and hell may have come from farther west than India and be associated with some branch of the Christian Church, and that the doctrine of salvation which Buddhism brought to China was not its own, but had been appropriated by it; especially that the doctrine of Amitabha, the Saviour, is a "Western accretion." "The influence of Buddhism on Western theology through Gnosticism, which is

only another word for Buddhism, has already been referred to [p. 86—Pfleiderer is the authority], and there can be little doubt that Western ideas of retribution and salvation, possibly Messianic, more probably Christian, are at the base of the teachings of the Mahayana system as found in China and Japan" (p. 262 f.).

That Gnosticism "is only another word for Buddhism" does not mean that Gnosticism is only Buddhism under another name, but that the author is trifling with an etymological parallel which is not parallel. As for Christian influence in Mahayana doctrine, the initial question is, Through what channel did an "essence of Christianity" reach India or China in the early centuries of our era from which everything specifically Christian had been eliminated?

One of the best things about this volume is the spirit in which it is written, and the incidental counsels to those who expect to be missionaries among the Chinese are as admirable in temper as they are wise in substance. The book may be commended not only to future missionaries and those particularly interested in missions, but to general readers, as the clearest and most comprehensive popular presentation of the subject that has appeared.

George F. Moore.

Harvard University.

The New Philosophy of Henri Bergson. Édouard LeRoy. Translated from the French by Vincent Benson, M.A. Henry Holt & Co. 1913. Pp. x, 235. $1.25.

Bergson and the Modern Spirit: An Essay in Constructive Thought. George Rowland Dodson, Ph.D. American Unitarian Association, Boston. 1913. Pp. vi, 304. $1.35.

M. LeRoy writes with the enthusiasm of a disciple, and at the same time with the conviction and mastery of one who has thought things out for himself. "It is after cool consideration," he says, "with full consciousness of the exact value of words, that we are able to pronounce the revolution which it [Bergson's work] effects equal in importance with that effected by Kant, or even by Socrates" (pp. 1–2). But he remarks in the Preface that he has not had the honor of being Bergson's pupil, and that when he became acquainted with Bergson's philosophy his own direct reflection had already produced in him similar trains of thought. The Preface contains also Bergson's acknowledgment of the author's "deep sympathy of thought" and "power of rethinking the subject in a personal and original manner" (p. vi). M. LeRoy is un-

doubtedly peculiarly qualified to expound the quintessence of Bergsonism, and this he has successfully accomplished in the present volume. It is to be recommended to any reader who requires a condensed and summary statement of the matter made with a persuasiveness which is exceeded only by the original texts themselves.

It becomes increasingly apparent that there is one crucial question which is decisive for the truth or falsity of the Bergsonian philosophy. Is there or is there not a clear and trustworthy experience in which a something that may be called process, change, activity, life, creation, continuity, or real time, is revealed as an unanalyzable datum? Those who oppose Bergson will be those who either find nothing of the sort, or always find some peculiar complex or manifold of different items in the context to which they are referred. Those who support Bergson must appeal to a unique experience, in which differences are somehow both given and not given: given because they may be explicated by analysis and are virtually referred to whenever the experience is described; not given because they are somehow coalesced or melted into one another. If this paradox is examined by logical methods, the opponent of Bergson must be successful. If, on the other hand, the advocate of Bergson appeals to an illumination which is more authoritative than logic, he withdraws the matter from discussion and retires into a conviction which will be undisturbed because it is wholly private. "The revelation," says M. LeRoy, "is overpowering, and once vouchsafed will never afterwards be forgotten." Never, perhaps, by M. LeRoy, or by any individual for whom the revelation was a profound personal experience; but in the annals of the impersonal enterprise of knowledge it will, I venture to say, never find a place.

There is nothing essentially incorrect in appealing to intuition; for if by this one means a direct inspection of matters under discussion or the peculiar importance attaching to perception as contrasted with discursive thought, it is the fundamental thesis of all empiricism. But Bergson's method is radical and, as I think, vicious, in that he attaches cognitive priority to the sort of immediacy that precedes analysis or that may be recovered only by forgetting analysis. It is to impute oracular validity to that "first fine careless rapture" which precedes the serious effort to know. To know immediately is at least to exercise attention and discrimination, and to discover complexity where experience at first blush was confused or chaotic. "*Absolute* knowledge is found to be the result of *inte-*

gral experience" (p. 35). But the central fallacy of Bergsonism is to suppose that when we first experience that which upon further examination turns out to be multiple or infinite, we somehow experience all that such later examination could reveal. "We are aware of the elementary disturbances which constitute matter in the perceptible quality in which they suffer contraction, as we are aware of the beating of our heart in the general feeling that we have of living" (p. 35). But we are not aware of the beating of our heart until discrimination has emphasized it, brought it into view. Nor is it possible to envisage the totality of such discriminable aspects in any single immediate experience. Either they are ignored altogether, as is the case with ordinary unsophisticated experience, or they must be described in the summaries and formulas of science.

Dr. Dodson lays stress on the relations of Bergson to his contemporaries, and on the ethical and religious implications of his philosophy. As respects the first question, one may properly take exception to his references to William James. The statement that "the American philosopher follows the Frenchman in his theory, we may even say his demonstration, of the impossibility of knowing the fullness and richness of life through conceptual thought" (p. 222) is, to say the least, misleading, in view of the contents of James's *Reflex Action and Theism*, published in 1881. What the author means by saying that James "frankly admitted the valid criticisms offered against his original theory of pragmatism, and made so many concessions that practically nothing was left of it at last except the part of it that argument can never reach"—passes comprehension. Again, the author appears to believe that, according to James, "if we are to know the true from the false, there must be some reference to a reality outside our experience" (p. 212). I say "appears to believe," because in another passage (p. 207) the author expresses himself ambiguously. In any case he ignores James's conception of an experiential reality as this is set forth in the *Essays on Radical Empiricism*. The whole discussion of James, as well, I should say, as of Dewey, is careless and inadequate.

The question of the ethical and religious implications of Bergson's philosophy is, I suppose, inevitable, although I suspect that Bergson himself would be the first to condemn it as premature. As the question is discussed in the present volume, little more is accomplished than to show that Bergson does prove morally and spiritually stimulating to Dr. Dodson, and otherwise to bring to light the limitations and internal difficulties of Bergson's system as thus far set forth. We are told that ethical and religious beliefs may turn

out to be "primary instincts," and so to possess an authoritativeness above that of the intellect which would discredit them (pp. 133–134). This might be the case if morality and religion were instinctive—and there is every reason to believe that they are not—or if instincts were beliefs which could be either true or false. The proposal to establish beliefs by claiming that they are in some loose sense "instinctive," can only prove that Bergsonism lends comfort to obscurantism through its limited but ill-guarded treatment of "instinct" as cognitive. As for the more fundamental question of the "purposiveness" of the world, Dr. Dodson finds it necessary to dissent from Bergson, and succeeds only in showing the opposition in Bergson of two notions, that of sheer impetus or *vis a tergo*, and that of direction, growth, or realization; and the further opposition between the unity of life and the extreme diversity of its fortunes. If Bergsonism means only that man and nature are continuous, or that man may be taken to be a product of nature by which nature herself may be judged, Bergsonism enjoys no religious advantage over any other evolutionary philosophy. If one requires a guarantee that nature is progressively dominated by life of the human sort, and that things are sure to move and move consistently in this direction, one will not find it in Bergson's philosophy. On the contrary, one will find that the somewhat sporadic and exceptional character of human life, and the essentially spontaneous and unpredictable character of all life, both argue against it.

M. LeRoy is on safer ground when he protests against estimating the ethical and religious possibilities of Bergson in terms of his present thought. It is characteristic of Bergson to take up one problem at a time, and it is also characteristic that each new book reveals something essentially new and unexpected. Hence though we must wait, we have good ground for hope. Though we may be confident that there will be a Bergsonian ethics or religion, it would scarcely be Bergsonian if we could predict it in advance.

Ralph Barton Perry.

Harvard University.

Schleiermacher: A Critical and Historical Study. W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D., Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford. E. P. Dutton & Co. 1913. Pp. ix, 272.

The announcement of a new work on Schleiermacher in English raises great expectations; all the more when the one who undertakes it is the Principal of Mansfield College. No book could be

more needed, and no source could be more appropriate. One must confess, however, to some disappointment that Dr. Selbie has conceived his task so narrowly. He confines his attention almost exclusively to Schleiermacher, the systematic theologian. Of the other aspects of this many-sided character, at once philosopher, moralist, man of letters, preacher, and patriot, we have but the briefest notice.

This restriction is perhaps natural in a book whose subject is professedly theological. The series in which Dr. Selbie's book appears has as its title, *The Great Theologies*, and under the circumstances the author can hardly be blamed for concentrating his attention upon Schleiermacher's significance as a theologian, especially when he is dealing with one who is confessedly the father of modern Protestant theology.

Yet theology is after all an effect of wider causes. For its understanding one must know not only the philosophical background but also the social and religious environment in the widest sense. This is particularly true of Schleiermacher, whose many-sided personality touched the life of his times at every point and from each drew something of value for his work. Dr. Selbie recognizes this fully in his introductory chapter, but he does not follow out its consequences in detail. As a result, his exposition of Schleiermacher's system assumes a technical character suggestive of the classroom, and its wider human aspects receive inadequate illustration.

This is due in part to the method which Dr. Selbie has followed. He confines himself closely to an exposition of Schleiermacher's teaching, using often his own words. But Schleiermacher is a German in habits of thought and feeling as well as in style, and needs translation not simply into English words but into English methods of thought and expression. The very fidelity with which our author confines himself to Schleiermacher's own language obscures rather than clarifies his subject-matter. Indeed the German atmosphere in which his hero moves affects Dr. Selbie's own style—words like *Vermittler* and *Romantiker* more than once finding their way into the English text (pp. 21, 83).

Of the eight chapters on Schleiermacher's theology two are given to an exposition of his philosophy of religion, and the remaining six to his system as such. The material of the former is derived from the *Reden* and follows the order of Schleiermacher's own treatment. In the latter, which is based largely upon the *Glaubenslehre*, Dr. Selbie has exercised greater freedom, using the familiar rubrics of the theological system: God, the Person of Christ, man and sin,

the work of Christ, the Christian life, the church. This arrangement is convenient for the theological student who desires to know what Schleiermacher taught topic by topic, but it is not adapted to give the reader the best introduction to the genesis of Schleiermacher's own thought or the relative importance of the different themes which he treated. For this we have to refer to other works of Schleiermacher, notably his *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums*. Dr. Selbie recognizes the importance of this, rightly saying that it lays the foundation of all future systems of theology. But he makes little use of it in his discussion, and the reader is left without information as to how it has come to pass that a book whose theoretical positions have been rejected with practical unanimity by Schleiermacher's successors, should have exercised so profound an influence.

If we were to criticise Dr. Selbie's book (apart from the formal matters already mentioned) it would be that in his discussion of his author he does not discriminate clearly enough between the fundamental structural questions on which Schleiermacher's work was epoch-making, and the more familiar theological material which he shares with other Christian teachers. One could wish that to the chapters he has given us he had added others dealing with such subjects as the Nature of Religion, the Essence of Christianity, and above all, theology itself; in which all the materials in Schleiermacher's work could have been grouped which deal with these fundamental questions, the genesis of his thought traced, the difference between his earlier and his later positions explained, his relations to his predecessors, his contemporaries, and his successors pointed out, and his distinctive contribution to theological science estimated. Dr. Selbie has furnished the materials for such a study, but he has not himself given it to us.

But criticism is ungracious in a field where there is so great a dearth of literature and every new book is to be welcomed. It is a reproach to our English theology that for so many years we have neglected the greatest of the modern Protestant theologians. Dr. Selbie has helped to wipe away this reproach by calling attention more clearly than before to the importance of the subject and the greatness of the need. It is to be hoped that his book will serve to prepare the way for the more exhaustive treatment of this great figure for which the world still waits.

William Adams Brown.

Union Theological Seminary.

ETERNAL LIFE: A STUDY OF ITS IMPLICATIONS AND APPLICATIONS. BARON FREDRICH VON HÜGEL. T. & T. Clark. 1912. Pp. lii, 443.

This is a remarkable, most interesting, and very inspiring book. It appears from the preface that the work grew out of a request for an article upon "Eternal Life" for Dr. Hastings's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*. Becoming too long for the *Encyclopaedia*, arrangement was made for its publication as a separate book. The author is a well-known student in Biblical criticism and philosophy. He was born in Florence in 1852, where his father was then the Austrian Ambassador. His mother was an English lady. A serious illness in childhood left him for many years the victim of ill health. He went to live in England in 1871, and later married an English wife. The fact that he is a member of the Roman Catholic Church makes his book, if possible, all the more interesting.

The subject of the book is not immortality, as a glance at the title might hastily lead one to infer. It is rather the deeper problem and the foundation of all valid religion, of which the hope of immortality may be considered a corollary. Eternal Life is here another name for God. Is there such Life behind all phenomena, infinite, adorable, the ultimate Reality, toward which every movement of human growth and aspiration instinctively reaches up, without which the unfathomable mystery of the world is inexplicable, but in the sublime thought of which man's mind finds satisfaction? If the Eternal Life is seen to be the Reality, if we may justly think of ourselves in relation to that Life as in a true sense its children, then all is well, the mystery of evil will somehow be found to come within the realm of the victorious goodness, and there will never be fear of death for those who have experienced the life of God.

With so great a subject, it is a delight to take as guide a genuine scholar richly equipped in the history of philosophy, distinctly constructive and positive in his treatment, but thoroughly critical and aware of every kind of difficulty, possessed of the best modern scientific openness of mind and a generous hospitality to the contributions of sincere thinkers of every school. In this volume of nearly five hundred pages there is not a paragraph of controversial material, or one which fails to carry at least the sympathetic respect of any reader interested in the discussion of religion.

The author's method of approach is broadly historical. He goes back to the earliest-known thinkers and makes their utterances tell the story of the coming of the consciousness of Eternal Life into the world. He traces the line of this light through a wide variety of experience, wherever genuine and memorable utterances give it

expression. He shows the Christian tradition, so far from being the only revelation of "the life of God in the soul of man," as rather the grand central movement of the stream of spiritual experience. He never antagonizes any thinker who has an aspect of truth to report. Thus, in his treatment of Spinoza, of Schopenhauer, of Nietzsche, of Bergson, he sets forth each one at his best, making clear account of his message and its value, and most interestingly uses the keen edge of his sympathetic criticism to show how the partial view of a one-sided or even inverted philosophy is a testimony to the necessity and reality of an all-round conception of religion. Even the cry of the pessimist is the mark of the hunger of the soul for the Living God. In all this there is no effect of ingenuity or of special pleading. It is rather the grasp of a comprehensive mind, accustomed to act in every direction, without a suspicion that truth can be hurt by the most fearless inquiry. Above all, the reader feels that he is in the company of a man who knows religion from within. Many a writer upon religion discusses the subject *ab extra*, as scientific theorists used to discuss aërial navigation, without ever having seen an air-ship. Here is a writer upon religion who, besides knowing everything that dubious theorizers can say to the contrary, actually knows the Eternal Life, as a man who has travelled in an aëroplane knows the conditions of the control of the air. In this respect Baron von Hügel's treatment of a variety of religious experiences, although only incidental to the main purpose of the book, seems vastly richer and more thorough and reasonable than William James's big book; who overbalances his pages with morbid examples, and always seems, even when most constructive, to be dealing with phenomena outside of his own personal knowledge.

In another interesting chapter on "Institutional Religion" we have a suggestive discussion of the church's seeming loss of ground as an institution. Being a Roman Catholic, the author here treats specially of the problems of his own church, and of the peculiar difficulties that attend it from the collision of its traditional modes of conduct—for instance, toward science, in the use of the Canon Law, in its unyielding claim of the right of persecution—with the strongest currents of modern thought. Frankly critical as he is, a thorough modernist in his knowledge of the conditions of our present world, he finds the cult and worship, especially the habit of adoration, the symbolism, the rich tradition of the Catholic Church, too precious and practically too useful to change his conviction of the essential divineness of the ancient organization. Moreover, he contrives to maintain a good hope that, as it has slowly learned some things in

the past—for example, to accept the Copernican astronomy—it will likewise develop so as to become worthy of the confidence of the world. This will be, not so much because of outward changes, as because of the absolute necessity in the life of man for the consciousness of the Infinite Life, and because the church will minister more and more effectively to this profound need. It is rather hard to believe that if Baron von Hügel had not been born into the Roman Communion, he would ever have been able to join it. For he seems to belong to the noble list of the free spirits who, taking their religion "at first hand," can hardly bear the yoke of external authority.

One would like to quote many an eloquent and stirring passage from this unusual book. It is full of great utterances of religion, carrying their own weight and evidence. It is also rich in philosophical criticism, dominated by a faith and a philosophy so high that smaller and partial philosophies fall into their place as so many approximate efforts after that which indeed must transcend every endeavor of the mind of man.

Charles F. Dole.

Jamaica Plain.

Religion and Life. Elwood Worcester, Ph.D. Harper & Brothers. 1914. Pp. 264. $1.25.

Dr. Worcester divides into three parts his study of religion—its relation to the community, to Jesus, and to the individual soul. Of these the second will perhaps be found most valuable, for it shows much insight into the history and character of Jesus. Views of critical scholars, which with them are apt to stop at intellectual conclusions, Dr. Worcester develops upon their religious side, exhibiting in them food for meditation and growth. Thus the view, which Schweitzer has emphasized, that Jesus regarded the end of the world as near at hand, is shown by Dr. Worcester as moulding Jesus' plans and shaping his action.[5] We may indeed question the author's interpretation of the crime of Judas. This he considers to have been not the indication to the authorities of the place where Jesus was to be found; not the pointing out to them of the individual; but the betrayal to them of Jesus' claim to be the Messiah, which —so he holds—had up to that time been carefully kept secret.

But whether we agree with the author in this or not, we welcome the clearness with which he connects the remarkable events in Jesus' career with the laws which govern all life. The majority of

[5] P. 121 ff.

his miracles, for example, he holds to be the same in kind as the cures which are now regarded as psychical. His resurrection was the inevitable result of his character; while his appearance after his resurrection and the many alleged reappearances of men after death, cast much interpretative light on each other.[6] The book shows penetration into many situations narrated in the Bible,[7] and into the ways of character, human and Divine.

Frederic Palmer.

Harvard University.

Theodore Thornton Munger: New England Minister. Benjamin W. Bacon. Yale University Press. 1913. Pp. xxiv, 409. $3.00.

This is a very sumptuous volume. Save for a most excruciating typographical error on page 115, extending over four lines, and reminding the reader of the careless proof-reading of his morning paper, the publishers have left nothing to be desired. The Press of the University has done its best to honor its erstwhile Fellow.

And yet it would seem to the reviewer that the book is a little too sumptuous for the record of a life so unassuming and tender as that of Dr. Munger. And the pages fit the binding; the style of the volume is very redundant. Two or three times we are reminded of the distinction between Congregationalism as a principle and Congregationalism as a "denomination"; quotations from addresses or documents are repeated in different chapters, and the theological situation in New England and American Congregationalism, out of which grew the demand for a denominational creed, is set before us more than once at wearisome length. Indeed, when we have closed the book, the situation in which Dr. Munger worked and which he attempted to relieve bulks larger to us than Dr. Munger himself.

The author, Dr. Bacon of Yale, is a very busy man and a most prolific writer, and the biography is to him evidently as much a labor of love as the sketch that Dr. Munger wrote of his father-in-law. We should not perhaps, therefore, apply to it the ordinary canons of criticism. But we cannot refrain from wishing that the book followed a less obvious outline and was less hurriedly written. Immediately after the preface we have a three-page chronology of the dates of Dr. Munger's life, and the book follows the chronological record quite closely. But the chronology has but little interest aside from the circle of Dr. Munger's closest friends;

[6] P. 158.

[7] The surprises of the hereafter, p. 45; Moses, p. 48 f.; Naaman, p. 222 f.

his outer life was very uneventful and his civic and national influence quite meagre. Disappointments in the relation between himself and his parishioners in his early pastorate, the publication of his notable books, *On the Threshold* and *The Freedom of Faith*, his settlements in North Adams and New Haven, are not exciting. The author interests us in Dr. Munger's carefully wrought-out decision to abide in the freedom of the Congregational ministry in spite of the attractiveness of the Episcopal order to a man of his aesthetic tastes, and in the important part he took in the spread of the "New Theology," but after all the greatest thing about Dr. Munger was the quality of his soul, and we wish that we might have caught a fuller vision of it through the medium of his writings. Little well-chosen snatches from his letters or his reminiscences scattered through the volume make us wish for more. Take, for example, such sentences as these: "The loose, not the anchored boat shows which way the tide turns." "We [Congregationalists] cluster about great preachers and call great audiences strong churches." "The rich men and their retainers withdrew from the congregation [of Center Church, Haverhill], leaving it poor in money but rich in patriotism. I regard that episode as the best part of my ministry." "[The sea] is the unfinished or undeveloped part of creation—without variety and hence limited in its suggestion." "Judgment is a continuous process and is merciful—being a gracious separation between good and evil. It is therefore represented as the office of the Christ." "Were these restraints removed, it [the Episcopal Church] would open a path that many would delight to walk in; but the paths in which Americans prefer to walk are those in which two can walk abreast within, as well as without, chancel bars."

After all, perhaps the best way to perpetuate the memory of a Christian minister is not through a biography but through an annotated edition of his most characteristic utterances and his most delightful letters. We wish that Dr. Bacon might give us such a volume of this Christlike and unselfish man.

THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY. HENRY C. VEDDER. The Macmillan Co. 1914. Pp. ii, 466. $3.00.

According to Professor Vedder, "The economic interpretation of history has not yet been applied to the period of the Reformation, and that fact is the chief justification of this attempt to retell a story that has been so often told, and yet told inadequately" (p. ix). The reader's surprise at the first part of this statement is less than his

astonishment, on finishing the book, at the author's claim to write from the economic standpoint. Save for a few pages in the introduction, and a few words in one other place, there is nothing whatever on economics. All told, there is far less than in the standard political and church histories—*The Cambridge Modern History* and Lindsay, for example. Mr. Vedder professes to have outgrown the "great man" theory, and condemns the scholars who would explain the success of the Reformation by picturing Luther "as the colossus who bestrode Europe, by his towering personality dwarfing all men of his age" (p. xiii). This history, however, is little but a biography of Luther, and on page 367 we find him described in the very words previously condemned: "Luther bestrode Europe like a Colossus, dwarfing all men of his time," upon whom "he stamped his personality." Like the German scholars Thudichum and Wappler, Professor Vedder writes from the Baptist standpoint, but, though his sympathies are plainly with the Anabaptists, whom he believes to have been the only really evangelical sect of the time, he cannot be accused of unfairness.

In his foreword, Professor Vedder assures us that he has spent years of faithful study on the subject, and, of the vast literature, "is reasonably confident that he has missed little of substantial value" (p. x). Yet he does not know the Weimar edition of Luther's works, nor the edition of the letters by Enders and Kawerau, nor the new sources of the table-talk. He ignores the indispensable works of Denifle, Grisar, and Pastor, as well as the *Reichstagsakten* and *Nuntiaturberichte*. These are but conspicuous examples, for of the great number of special works, a very small proportion seems to have been consulted by him. Nor does he make good use of the sources he quotes. On page 59 he speaks of a letter by Cardinal Rovere of April 3, 1518; it should have been easy to discover, what has often been pointed out, that the letter is really by Riario, and of date 1520. A worse error of the same sort occurs on page 66. On pages 84 and 90 he speaks of a letter of Luther to the Pope, of March 3, 1519; though Köstlin (whom he quotes in his bibliography) has proved that the letter was really written in January but never sent. On pages 67–68 he describes at length the dispatch of a papal brief to Cajetan, its receipt, and its effect; and then in a note informs us that "Ranke has shown that there are insuperable difficulties in the way of accepting its genuineness"! The well-known saying of Luther about washing his hands in the papists' blood (Weimar ed., vi, 347; Erlangen ed. *Opera latina varii argumenti*, ii, 107) he quotes from Bax, remarking, "I have been unable to locate it in Luther's

writings." Jerome Ghinucci, Bishop of Ascoli, meets us in these pages as "Episcopus Asculanus" (p. 68); Brück as Brinck (p. 144); the names of the Zwickau prophets are given in a variety of incorrect forms (p. 183).

Whatever value the book might still have with these limitations is destroyed by the author's habitual and gross carelessness. A cursory reading revealed more than fifty errors of some importance, a list continually growing. For example, on page xvi there are five mistakes. First it is said that there were no fewer than fifteen editions, each edition of a thousand or less, of the German Bible prior to Luther's time, making in all not less than a hundred thousand copies! Further down, in a list of nine universities founded within "fifteen" (meaning "fifty") years, the dates of the founding of two are incorrect, and Mainz is confounded with "Metz." On page xxiii we are told that Dürer never drew Melanchthon's likeness. On page 40 we learn that in 1514 "the Turks were threatening an invasion of Europe," which did indeed happen in 1529. On page 140 there are three mistakes, one in the date of the burning of the Pope's bull, one in the quotation from Luther on that occasion, and one in giving the number of students at Wittenberg. In note 2 to page 277 Bugenhagen and "Pomeranius" (for "Pomeranus") are spoken of as two different persons; Von der Planitz is metamorphosed into "John a Plaintz" and Erasmus Alber is simply called "Erasmus, *not* of Rotterdam." Of the numerous quotations in Latin hardly one is printed without some gross error. It is hard to see how the proofreader of Macmillan could have let pass "*conitamus*" and "*videbemus*" (both p. 203, note 1). Cicero's letters to Atticus are quoted as his "letters to Athens," and given the wrong date, 90 B.C. (p. 201, note). A double snare is found in Erasmus's remark: "*Ego posui ovem gallinaceum, Lutherus exclusit pullum longe dissimillimum,*" which is rendered: "I laid a cock's egg; Luther has hatched a pullet of a very different breed" (p. 229).

It is not pleasant to write a wholly unfavorable review, but if criticism is to do its duty to scholarship, work like this must not be allowed to pass untried by the fire.

PRESERVED SMITH.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y.

THE PURITANS IN POWER. A STUDY IN THE HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH FROM 1640 TO 1660. G. B. TATHAM, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Cambridge University Press. 1913. Pp. vi, 282. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Mr. Tatham's book contains a brief preface, eight chapters, and an appendix of three sections. The preface states his purpose: he has in mind "the immediate and material results of the Puritan revolution rather than the influence exercised upon religious thought, upon the future history of parties within the Church, or upon the relations of the Church to Dissent." The eight chapters are: The Prelude; The Parochial Clergy; The Sequestration Committees; The Regulation of Cambridge University; The Puritan Visitation of Oxford University; The Fate of the Ejected Clergy; Religious Freedom under the Puritans; Church Property. The Appendix includes: An Inventory of Prestwick Rectory; The Case of Sylvester Adams; The Seizure of College Plate at Cambridge. From the contents it will be noticed that Mr. Tatham has not attempted an exhaustive description of the various ideals and achievements of Puritanism, and that he has selected a few significant episodes within the period of Puritan ascendency. It will also be seen that the choice is careful and illuminating. The vital problems of the period are the actual point of view of clergy and laity within this twenty years, the treatment of the vanquished by the victors, the temper of the universities and how it modified with the new government, the disposition of property, and the quality of religious toleration. The author has met each of these questions and has dealt with it carefully, equipped as he is with mature knowledge of sources and literature. He has shown himself singularly free from bias and devoted to a simple and honest display of the facts. More than this, he has made it clear that the Puritan success was based upon English feeling rather than upon mere party prejudice; he has been discriminating enough to perceive and to express the permanent value of both the Presbyterian and the Cromwellian aspects of the movement. It would be hardly correct to say that the book offers a contribution to the subject (except in so far as lucid description is always a contribution), for it is dealing with too familiar ground for such praise. But it is quite true to say that it is an attractive and scholarly presentation of material and results that are by no means widely known.

HENRY B. WASHBURN.

EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL, CAMBRIDGE.

English Sects. A History of Nonconformity. W. B. Selbie. (The Home University Library of Modern Knowledge). Henry Holt & Co. Pp. 256. 50 cents.

In this small volume the learned Principal of Mansfield College has presented the salient facts of Nonconformist history with great clearness and a high degree of impartiality. The space at his disposal has made impossible any extensive characterization of leaders or elaborate discussion of movements, but the reader who comes to these pages will gain from them a distinct impression of the aims, vicissitudes, and present significance of these important elements in English religious life. As a brief introductory survey the work is likely to be useful.

Williston Walker.

Yale University.

Present Day Theology. Washington Gladden. McClelland & Co. Columbus, Ohio. Pp. 220.

Stirred by obnoxious revival services conducted by a theologically illiterate evangelist, Dr. Gladden preached in his own church in Columbus a series of week-day sermons designed to overcome evil with good by a clear presentation of the views now entertained by leading preachers and theologians in different Protestant communions. Of Congregationalists, he quotes frequently from President King of Oberlin and Professor Stevens of Yale; of Presbyterians, from Professor Brown of Union; of Baptists, from Professor Clarke of Colgate; and of Episcopalians, from Phillips Brooks—with the manifest purpose of showing that the theology he advocates is no individual whimsey but is really representative of modern religious thinking. The sermons were hastily prepared and hurriedly printed, but they have a movement and fervor which would probably have been lacking in more studied and deliberate productions. If any one doubts whether the so-called new theology is preachable, he may be confidently commended to this volume of theology at pulpit temperature.

W. W. Fenn.

Harvard University.

The First Principles of Evolution. S. Herbert, M.D. The Macmillan Company. 1913. Pp. 346. $2.00.

It was a well-known geologist who said of Professor Dana's *Manual of Geology* that it contained "all that the Lord had ever made," but that "it would take the Lord himself to find it." Dr. Herbert's

book, however, while exceptionally broad in scope, is admirably arranged. It presents evolutionary thought from Heraclitus to Bergson and the various aspects of evolution from atomic to cosmic, from inorganic to "superorganic" evolution, all in admirable and logical order. In his preface the author states that the book is the outcome of a series of lectures given to a class of workingmen "and others." It must not be inferred, however, that the lecturer has "stooped" to his audience. While the book is intentionally "thoroughly superficial," Dr. Herbert has not hesitated to raise some of the more abstruse and controversial problems of speculative science.

To present "the problem of evolution comprehensively in all its aspects"—which the author states to be his purpose in writing the book—is a task of no small magnitude and one which few biologists would be willing to undertake. Dr. Herbert has been remarkably successful, notwithstanding the enormous difficulty of condensing so large a mass of material. While such a work is of necessity largely one of compilation, the writer seems at all times the master of his material. That at times the treatment of important problems should be fragmentary and disconnected is perhaps inevitable. The broad scope of the volume is indicated by the following summary: Evolution is discussed under three general headings—inorganic, organic, and superorganic. Under inorganic evolution the writer describes the hypothetical changes in the stellar universe and in the solar system. The alternative views of Kant-LaPlace and of Chamberlin-Moulton are well stated and the difficulties involved in the acceptance of either admitted. The stages in the geological history of the earth are then sketched briefly. Even atomic evolution, including the electronic theory of matter, receives consideration. The spontaneous generation of living substance is postulated, and Pflüger's theory of the origin of proteid substance suggested.

Organic evolution receives a somewhat conventional treatment, summarizing the various kinds of evidence which have convinced morphologists of the fact of the physical evolution of organisms. This is followed by a statement of the various hypotheses brought forward to explain evolution in terms of mechanism—the explanations of Darwin, Lamarck, DeVries, and their successors. Sexual selection is not ruled out of court. But the author concludes that biologists have still to discover "an unknown factor" in order to explain the progressive adaptation of organisms to their environment. Some theologians will derive much comfort from this admission of an open-minded biologist. But it is not likely, however,

that Dr. Herbert would be willing to admit that we are yet driven to assume a psychical or "vitalistic," much less a supernatural factor, in organic evolution.

Under superorganic evolution he discusses the phenomena of psychical, social, and religious (theological) evolution. Here as elsewhere in the book the treatment is consistently naturalistic. Moral evolution in animals and man receives a treatment similar to that given to the problem of the physical and racial origin of man. The book closes with a presentation of the evolutionary philosophy of Bergson. Dr. Herbert really appears to understand Bergson. A very valuable bibliography is added. The glossary of scientific terms will help the lay reader.

HERBERT V. NEAL.
TUFTS COLLEGE.

HYMNS OF THE EARLY CHURCH. Translated by Rev. JOHN BROWNLIE, D.D. Morgan & Scott. London. 1913. Pp. 202.

This book contains about a hundred hymns "translated from Greek and Latin sources; together with translations from a later period; centos and suggestions from the Greek; and several original pieces."

Such a book, to be of value, should do one of two things: it should introduce us to a body of hymns hitherto known only to the student, with opportunities for careful comparison with the originals; or, if the author departs from the ideal of a close translation, it should offer free and beautiful renderings, making available for actual use in modern churches hymns hitherto not rendered into English, or but ill translated. Unfortunately, Dr. Brownlie's volume does neither. It is often impossible to say whether one is reading an "original piece" or a translation, for the originals are indicated in the most casual fashion. Sometimes the first line of the Greek or Latin is given, but elsewhere the reader is left to guess for himself the source whence Dr. Brownlie has drawn his inspiration. Nor have many of these translations such merit as to lead to their introduction for their own sake into modern hymn-books. There are, it is true, occasional striking lines and good stanzas, but the high level is seldom long maintained and there are not infrequent evidences of careless writing.

The volume illustrates, as others of its kind have done before, the difficulty of such translation. The ancient hymns represent a type of thought and a mode of expression far removed from our own, and not to be acclimated save by a writer who can add con-

scientious scholarship and genuine poetical gifts to his relish for the beauty and vigor of the hymnody of the early church. Otherwise, however much the translator may enjoy the performance of his pleasant task, his work is not likely to result in any permanent enrichment of the great treasure-house of song.

HENRY WILDER FOOTE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

THE QUEST OF THE BEST. WILLIAM DE WITT HYDE. Thomas Y. Crowell Company. Pp. viii, 267. $1.00.

In what the author describes as "Insights into Ethics," President Hyde sets before parents, teachers, and leaders of boys, some practical considerations as to the morals of youth. The book is the outcome of ethical discussions in class and in popular assemblies, and therefore is not a finished academic study; and the repeated plan of taking each thesis and applying it to twenty relations is a little cumbrous, and perhaps unfortunate. The result is not startlingly original; indeed, the author admits that its orthodoxy surprises himself. For example: natural badness is a stuff to be made over into goodness, of which it is the germ; artificial goodness falls short of the best; the best is the interest that fulfils all other interests in proportion to their worth; accepting anything less than the best is sin; and personal contact is the supreme mode of communicating moral power to youth.

In spite, however, of the familiar sound of these affirmations, the book should be of real and great value to the constituency it seeks. It gives the practical man an inkling of the larger principles of ethics which he often embodies unconsciously in his rule-of-thumb methods of conduct; and it sets before men who live in an age of moral extremes, the Aristotelian mean as the trembling equilibrium which ethics attains at the best. Not less valuable is the commonsense approach, the hopeful temper, and sympathetic mood of the book, and the hardy morality it inculcates. It should prove a most serviceable manual of practical use for the persons addressed in its pages.

GEORGE T. SMART.

NEWTON HIGHLANDS.